Boston Public Library
3 9999 10522 722 5

No. _____

THE TRVSTEES OF THE
PVBLIC LIBRARY
OMNIVM
LVX
CIVIVM
OF THE CITY OF
BOSTON
1852 - 1878

_____

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

VOL. CLXIII.

GL.
AP2
.N7
Vol. 163
1896
5.50.

"BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY"

3318

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

MEMORIAL LIBRARY ANDOVER

RE-ESTABLISHED BY A. T. RICE AND LLOYD BRYCE.

EDITED BY DAVID A. MUNRO.

VOL. CLXIII.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
No. 291 FIFTH AVENUE.
1896.

Copyright, 1896, by LLOYD BRYCE.
Copyright, 1896, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING CO.

All rights reserved.

051.
N81
163

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXVI.

JULY, 1896.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN CRITICISM.

BY MOSES COIT TYLER, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

I.

It can hardly be doubted that some hindrance to a right estimate of the Declaration of Independence is occasioned by either of two opposite conditions of mind, both of which are often to be met with among us: on the one hand, a condition of hereditary, uncritical awe and worship of the American Revolution, and of that state paper as its absolutely perfect and glorious expression; on the other hand, a later condition of cultivated distrust of the Declaration, as a piece of writing lifted up into inordinate renown by the passionate and heroic circumstances of its origin, and ever since then extolled beyond reason by the blind energy of patriotic enthusiasm. Turning from the former state of mind, which obviously calls for no further comment, we may note, as a partial illustration of the latter, that American confidence in the supreme intellectual merit of this all-famous document received a serious wound some forty years ago from the hand of Rufus Choate, when, with a courage greater than would now be required for such an act, he characterized it as made up of "glittering and sounding generalities of natural

Copyright, 1896, by Lloyd Bryce. All rights reserved.

8380

right."* What the great advocate then so unhesitatingly suggested, many a thoughtful American since then has at least suspected — that our great proclamation, as a piece of political literature, cannot stand the test of modern analysis; that it belongs to the immense class of over-praised productions; that it is, in fact, a stately patchwork of sweeping propositions of somewhat doubtful validity; that it has long imposed upon mankind by the well-known effectiveness of verbal glitter and sound; that, at the best, it is an example of florid political declamation belonging to the sophomoric period of our national life, a period which, as we flatter ourselves, we have now outgrown.

Nevertheless, it is to be noted that whatever authority the Declaration of Independence has acquired in the world, has been due to no lack of criticism, either at the time of its first appearance, or since then; a fact which seems to tell in favor of its essential worth and strength. From the date of its original publication down to the present moment, it has been attacked again and again, either in anger, or in contempt, by friends as well as by enemies of the American Revolution, by liberals in politics as well as by conservatives. It has been censured for its substance, it has been censured for its form, for its misstatements of fact, for its fallacies in reasoning, for its audacious novelties and paradoxes, for its total lack of all novelty, for its repetition of old and threadbare statements, even for its downright plagiarisms; finally, for its grandiose and vaporing style.

II.

One of the earliest and ablest of its assailants was Thomas Hutchinson, the last civil governor of the colony of Massachusetts, who, being stranded in London by the political storm which had blown him thither, published there, in the autumn of 1776, his "Strictures Upon the Declaration of the Congress at Philadelphia,"† wherein, with an unsurpassed knowledge of the origin of the controversy, and with an unsurpassed acumen in the discussion of it, he traverses the entire document, paragraph by paragraph, for the purpose of showing that its allegations in support of American Independence are "false and frivolous."‡

* Letter of Rufus Choate to the Whigs of Maine, 1856.
† His pamphlet is dated October 15, 1776.
‡ "*Strictures*," etc., 3.

A better-written, and, upon the whole, a more plausible and a more powerful, arraignment of the great Declaration was the celebrated pamphlet by Sir John Dalrymple, "The Rights of Great Britain Asserted against the Claims of America: Being an Answer to the Declaration of the General Congress,"—a pamphlet scattered broadcast over the world at such a rate that at least eight editions of it were published during the last three or four months of the year 1776. Here, again, the manifesto of Congress is subjected to a searching examination, in order to prove that "the facts are either wilfully or ignorantly misrepresented, and the arguments deduced from premises that have no foundation in truth."* It is doubtful if any disinterested student of history, any competent judge of reasoning, will now deny to this pamphlet the praise of making out a very strong case against the historical accuracy and the logical soundness of many parts of the Declaration of Independence.

Undoubtedly, the force of such censures is for us much broken by the fact that they proceeded from men who were themselves partisans in the Revolutionary controversy, and bitterly hostile to the whole movement which the Declaration was intended to justify. Such is not the case, however, with the leading modern English critics of the same document, who, while blaming in severe terms the policy of the British Government toward the Thirteen Colonies, have also found much to abate from the confidence due to this official announcement of the reasons for our secession from the empire. For example, Earl Russell, after frankly saying that the great disruption proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence was a result which Great Britain had "used every means most fitted to bring about," such as "vacillation in council, harshness in language, feebleness in execution, disregard of American sympathies and affections," also pointed out that "the truth of this memorable Declaration" was "warped" by "one singular defect," namely, its exclusive and excessive arraignment of George the Third "as a single and despotic tyrant," much like Philip the Second to the people of the Netherlands.†

This temperate criticism from an able and a liberal English

* "*The Rights*," etc., 1-2. The copy used by me is the seventh edition, London, 1776.

† Lord John Russell, "*Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*," i., 151-152.

statesman of the present century may be said to touch the very core of the problem as to the historic justice of our great indictment of the last King of America; and there is deep significance in the fact that this is the very criticism upon the document, which, as John Adams tells us, he himself had in mind when it was first submitted to him in committee, and even when, shortly afterward, he advocated its adoption by Congress. After mentioning certain things in it with which he was delighted, he adds:

"There were other expressions which I would not have inserted if I had drawn it up—particularly that which called the King tyrant. I thought this too personal; for I never believed George to be a tyrant in disposition and in nature. I always believed him to be deceived by his courtiers on both sides of the Atlantic, and in his official capacity only cruel. I thought the expression too passionate, and too much like scolding, for so grave and solemn a document; but, as Franklin and Sherman were to inspect it afterwards, I thought it would not become me to strike it out. I consented to report it." *

A more minute and a more poignant criticism of the Declaration of Independence has been made in recent years by still another English writer of liberal tendencies, who, however, in his capacity as critic, seems here to labor under the disadvantage of having transferred to the document which he undertakes to judge much of the extreme dislike which he has for the man who wrote it, whom, indeed, he regards as a sophist, as a demagogue, as quite capable of inveracity in speech, and as bearing some resemblance to Robespierre "in his feline nature, his malignant egotism, and his intense suspiciousness, as well as in his bloody-minded, yet possibly sincere, philanthropy." † In the opinion of Prof. Goldwin Smith, our great national manifesto is written "in a highly rhetorical strain"; ‡ "it opens with sweeping aphorisms about the natural rights of man, at which political science now smiles, and which . . . might seem strange when framed for slave-holding communities by a publicist who

* "*The Works of John Adams*," ii., 514, note. The distinction here made by John Adams between the personal and the official character of George III. is quite pointless in its application to the Declaration of Independence; since it is of the King's official character only that the Declaration speaks. Moreover, John Adams's testimony in 1822 that he "never believed George to be a tyrant in disposition and nature," is completely destroyed by John Adams's own testimony on that subject as recorded at an earlier period of his life. For example, in 1780, in a letter to M. Dumas, he thus speaks of George III. under the name of "White Eyes": "Europe, in general, is much mistaken in that character; it is a pity that he should be believed to be so amiable; the truth is far otherwise. *Nerone neronior* is nearer the truth." *Ibid.*, vii., 327.

† Goldwin Smith, in *The Nineteenth Century*, No. 131, January, 1888, p. 109.

‡ "*The United States: An Outline of Political History*," 88.

himself held slaves" ;* while, in its specifications of fact, it "is not more scrupulously truthful than are the general utterances"† of the statesman who was its scribe. Its charges that the several offensive acts of the king, besides "evincing a design to reduce the colonists under absolute depotism," "all had as their direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny," are simply "propositions which history cannot accept."‡ Moreover, the Declaration "blinks the fact that many of the acts, styled steps of usurpation, were measures of repression, which, however unwise or excessive, had been provoked by popular outrage."§ "No government could allow its officers to be assaulted and their houses sacked, its loyal lieges to be tarred and feathered, or the property of merchants sailing under its flag to be thrown by lawless hands into the sea."‖ Even "the preposterous violence and the manifest insincerity of the suppressed clause" against slavery and the slave-trade "are enough to create suspicion as to the spirit in which the whole document was framed."¶

III.

Finally, as has been already intimated, not even among Americans themselves has the Declaration of Independence been permitted to pass on into the enjoyment of its superb renown, without much critical disparagement at the hands of statesmen and historians. No doubt Calhoun had its preamble in mind when he declared that "nothing can be more unfounded and false" than "the prevalent opinion that all men are born free and equal" ; for "it rests upon the assumption of a fact which is contrary to universal observation."** Of course, all Americans who have shared to any extent in Calhoun's doctrines respecting human society could hardly fail to agree with him in regarding as fallacious and worthless those general propositions in the Declaration which seem to constitute its logical starting point, as well as its ultimate defence.

Perhaps, however, the most frequent form of disparagement to which Jefferson's great state paper has been subjected among

* "*The United States*," etc., 87-88.
† *The Nineteenth Century*, No. 131, p. 111.
‡ "*The United States*," etc., 88.
§ *Ibid.*, 88.
‖ *The Nineteenth Century*, No. 131, p. 111.
¶ *Ibid.*
** "A Disquisition on Government" in "*The Works of John C. Calhoun*," i., 57.

us is that which would minimize his merit in composing it, by denying to it the merit of originality. For example, Richard Henry Lee sneered at it as a thing "copied from Locke's *Treatise on Government.*"* The author of a life of Jefferson, published in the year of Jefferson's retirement from the presidency, suggests that the credit of having composed the Declaration of Independence "has been perhaps more generally, than truly, given by the public" to that great man.† Charles Campbell, the historian of Virginia, intimates that some expressions in the document were taken without acknowledgment from Aphra Behn's tragi-comedy, "The Widow-Ranter, or the History of Bacon in Virginia."‡ John Stockton Littell describes the Declaration of Independence as "that enduring monument at once of patriotism, and of genius and skill in the art of appropriation" —asserting that "for the sentiments and much of the language" of it, Jefferson was indebted to Chief Justice Drayton's charge to the grand jury of Charleston, delivered in April, 1776, as well as to the Declaration of Independence said to have been adopted by some citizens of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, in May, 1775.§ Even the latest and most critical editor of the writings of Jefferson calls attention to the fact that a glance at the Declaration of Rights, as adopted by Virginia on the 12th of June, 1776, "would seem to indicate the source from which Jefferson derived a most important and popular part" of his famous production.‖ By no one, however, has the charge of a lack of originality been pressed with so much decisiveness as by John Adams, who took evident pleasure in speaking of it as a document in which were merely "recapitulated" previous and well-known statements of American rights and wrongs,¶ and who, as late as in the year 1822, deliberately wrote:

"There is not an idea in it but what had been hackneyed in Congress for two years before. The substance of it is contained in the declaration of rights and the violation of those rights, in the Journals of Congress, in 1774. Indeed, the essence of it is contained in a pamphlet, voted and printed by the town of Boston, before the first Congress met, composed by James Otis, as I suppose, in one of his lucid intervals, and pruned and polished by Samuel Adams."**

* "*The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*," H. A. Washington ed., vii., 39.
† Stephen Cullen Carpenter, "*Memoirs of Thomas Jefferson*," i., 11.
‡ "*History of .....Virginia*," 317.
§ Grayden's "*Men and Times of the American Revolution*," 323, note.
‖ Paul Leicester Ford, "*The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*," I Introd. xxvi.
¶ "*The Works of John Adams*," ii., 377.
** *Ibid.*, 514, note.

IV.

Perhaps nowhere in our literature would it be possible to find a criticism brought forward by a really able man against any piece of writing less applicable to the case, and of less force and value, than is this particular criticism by John Adams and others, as to the lack of originality in the Declaration of Independence. Indeed, for such a paper as Jefferson was commissioned to write, the one quality which it could not properly have had, the one quality which would have been fatal to its acceptance either by the American Congress or by the American people—is originality. They were then at the culmination of a tremendous controversy over alleged grievances of the most serious kind—a controversy that had been steadily raging for at least twelve years. In the course of that long dispute, every phase of it, whether as to abstract right or constitutional privilege or personal procedure, had been presented in almost every conceivable form of speech. At last, they had resolved, in view of all this experience, no longer to prosecute the controversy as members of the empire; they had resolved to revolt, and, casting off forever their ancient fealty to the British crown, to separate from the empire, and to establish themselves as a new nation among the nations of the earth. In this emergency, as it happened, Jefferson was called upon to put into form a suitable statement of the chief considerations which prompted them to this great act of revolution, and which, as they believed, justified it. What, then, was Jefferson to do? Was he to regard himself as a mere literary essayist, set to produce before the world a sort of prize-dissertation—a calm, analytic, judicial treatise on history and politics with a particular application to Anglo-American affairs—one essential merit of which would be its originality as a contribution to historical and political literature? Was he not, rather, to regard himself as, for the time being, the very mouthpiece and prophet of the people whom he represented, and as such required to bring together and to set in order, in their name, not what was new, but what was old; to gather up into his own soul, as much as possible, whatever was then also in their souls, their very thoughts and passions, their ideas of constitutional law, their interpretations of fact, their opinions as to men and as to events in all that ugly quarrel, their notions of justice, of civic dignity, of human rights; finally, their

memories of wrongs which seemed to them intolerable, especially of wrongs inflicted upon them during those twelve years by the hands of insolent and brutal men, in the name of the King, and by his apparent command ?

Moreover, as the nature of the task laid upon him made it necessary that he should thus state, as the reasons for their intended act, those very considerations both as to fact and as to opinion which had actually operated upon their minds, so did it require him to do so, to some extent, in the very language which the people themselves, in their more formal and deliberate utterances, had all along been using. In the development of political life in England and America, there had already been created a vast literature of constitutional progress—a literature common to both portions of the English race, pervaded by its own stately traditions, and reverberating certain great phrases which formed, as one may say, almost the vernacular of English justice, and of English aspiration for a free, manly and orderly political life. In this vernacular the Declaration of Independence was written. The phraseology thus characteristic of it is the very phraseology of the champions of constitutional expansion, of civic dignity and progress, within the English race ever since Magna Charta ; of the great state papers of English freedom in the seventeenth century, particularly the Petition of Right in 1629, and the Bill of Rights in 1789 ; of the great English Charters for colonization in America; of the great English exponents of legal and political progress—Sir Edward Coke, John Milton, Sir Philip Sidney, John Locke; finally, of the great American exponents of political liberty, and of the chief representative bodies, whether local or general, which had convened in America from the time of Stamp Act Congress until that of the Congress which resolved upon our independence. To say, therefore, that the official declaration of that resolve is a paper made up of the very opinions, beliefs, unbeliefs, the very sentiments, prejudices, passions, even the errors in judgment and the personal misconstructions—if they were such—which then actually impelled the American people to that mighty act, and that all these are expressed in the very phrases which they had been accustomed to use, is to pay to that state-paper the highest tribute as to its fitness for the purpose for which it was framed.

Of much of this, also, Jefferson himself seems to have been

conscious; and perhaps never does he rise before us with more dignity, with more truth, than when, late in his lifetime, hurt by the captious and jangling words of disparagement then recently put into writing by his old comrade, to the effect that the Declaration of Independence "contained no new ideas, that it is a commonplace compilation, its sentences hackneyed in Congress for two years before, and its essence contained in Otis's pamphlet," Jefferson quietly remarked that perhaps these statements might "all be true: of that I am not to be the judge. . . . Whether I had gathered my ideas from reading or reflection, I do not know. I know only that I turned to neither book nor pamphlet while writing it. I did not consider it as any part of my charge to invent new ideas altogether and to offer no sentiment which had ever been expressed before."*

Before passing from this phase of the subject, however, it should be added that, while the Declaration of Independence lacks originality in the sense just indicated, in another and perhaps in a higher sense, it possesses originality—it is individualized by the character and by the genius of its author. Jefferson gathered up the thoughts and emotions and even the characteristic phrases of the people for whom he wrote, and these he perfectly incorporated with what was already in his mind, and then to the music of his own keen, rich, passionate, and enkindling style, he mustered them into that stately and triumphant procession wherein, as some of us still think, they will go marching on to the world's end.

There were then in Congress several other men who could have written the Declaration of Independence, and written it well—notably Franklin, either of the two Adamses, Richard Henry Lee, William Livingston, and, best of all, but for his own opposition to the measure, John Dickinson; but had any one of these other men written the Declaration of Independence, while it would have contained, doubtless, nearly the same topics and nearly the same great formulas of political statement, it would yet have been a wholly different composition from this of Jefferson's. No one at all familiar with his other writings, as well as with the writings of his chief contemporaries, could ever have a moment's doubt, even if the fact were not already notorious,

* "*The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*," H. A. Washington ed., vii., 305.

that this document was by Jefferson. He put into it something that was his own, and that no one else could have put there. He put himself into it—his own genius, his own moral force, his faith in God, his faith in ideas, his love of innovation, his passion for progress, his invincible enthusiasm, his intolerance of prescription, of injustice, of cruelty; his sympathy, his clarity of vision, his affluence of diction, his power to fling out great phrases which will long fire and cheer the souls of men struggling against political unrighteousness.

And herein lies its essential originality, perhaps the most precious, and, indeed, almost the only, originality ever attaching to any great literary product that is representative of its time. He made for himself no improper claim, therefore, when he directed that upon the granite obelisk at his grave should be carved the words: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence."*

V.

If the Declaration of Independence is now to be fairly judged by us, it must be judged with reference to what it was intended to be, namely, an impassioned manifesto of one party, and that the weaker party, in a violent race-quarrel; of a party resolved, at last, upon the extremity of revolution, and already menaced by the inconceivable disaster of being defeated in the very act of armed rebellion against the mightiest military power on earth. This manifesto, then, is not to be censured because, being avowedly a statement of its own side of the quarrel, it does not also contain a moderate and judicial statement of the opposite side; or because, being necessarily partisan in method, it is likewise both partisan and vehement in tone; or because it bristles with accusations against the enemy so fierce and so unqualified as now to seem in some respects overdrawn; or because it resounds with certain great aphorisms about the natural rights of man, at which, indeed, political science cannot now smile, except to its own discomfiture and shame—aphorisms which are likely to abide in this world as the chief source and inspiration of heroic enterprises among men for self-deliverance from oppression.

Taking into account, therefore, as we are bound to do, the circumstances of its origin, and especially its purpose as a solemn

* Randall, "*The Life of Thomas Jefferson*," iii., 563.

and piercing appeal to mankind on behalf of a small and weak nation against the alleged injustice and cruelty of a great and powerful one, it still remains our duty to enquire whether, as has been asserted in our time, history must set aside either of the two central charges embodied in the Declaration of Independence.

The first of these charges affirms that the several acts complained of by the colonists evinced "a design to reduce them under absolute despotism," and had as their "direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny" over the American people. Was this, indeed, a groundless charge, in the sense intended by the words "despotism" and "tyranny"—that is, in the sense commonly given to those words in the usage of the English-speaking race? According to that usage, it was not an Oriental despotism that was meant, nor a Greek tyranny, nor a Roman, nor a Spanish. The sort of despot, the sort of tyrant, whom the English people, ever since the time of King John and especially during the period of the Stuarts, had been accustomed to look for and to guard against, was the sort of tyrant or despot that could be evolved out of the conditions of English political life. Furthermore, he was not by them expected to appear among them at the outset in the fully developed shape of a Philip or an Alva in the Netherlands. They were able to recognize him, they were prepared to resist him, in the earliest and most incipient stage of his being—at the moment, in fact, when he should make his first attempt to gain all power over his people, by assuming the single power to take their property without their consent. Hence it was, as Edmund Burke pointed out in the House of Commons only a few weeks before the American Revolution entered upon its military phase, that:

"The great contests for freedom . . . were from the earliest times chiefly upon the question of taxing. Most of the contests in the ancient commonwealths turned primarily on the right of election of magistrates, or on the balance among the several orders of the state. The question of money was not with them so immediate. But in England it was otherwise. On this point of taxes the ablest pens and most eloquent tongues have been exercised, the greatest spirits have acted and suffered . . . . They took infinite pains to inculcate, as a fundamental principle, that in all monarchies the people must in effect, themselves, mediately or immediately, possess the power of granting their own money, or no shadow of liberty could subsist. The colonies draw from you, as with their life-blood, these ideas and principles. Their love of liberty, as with you, fixed and attached on this specific

point of taxing. Liberty might be safe or might be endangered in twenty other particulars without their being much pleased or alarmed. Here they felt its pulse, and as they found that beat, they thought themselves sick or sound."*

Accordingly, the meaning which the English race on both sides of the Atlantic were accustomed to attach to the words "tyranny" and "despotism," was a meaning to some degree ideal; it was a meaning drawn from the extraordinary political sagacity with which that race is endowed, from their extraordinary sensitiveness as to the use of the taxing-power in government, from their instinctive perception of the commanding place of the taxing-power among all the other forms of power in the state, from their perfect assurance that he who holds the purse with the power to fill it and to empty it, holds the key of the situation —can maintain an army of his own, can rule without consulting Parliament, can silence criticism, can crush opposition, can strip his subjects of every vestige of political life; in other words, he can make slaves of them, he can make a despot and a tyrant of himself. Therefore, the system which in the end might develop into results so palpably tyrannic and despotic, they bluntly called a tyranny and a despotism in the beginning. To say, therefore, that the Declaration of Independence did the same, is to say that it spoke good English. Of course, history will be ready to set aside the charge thus made in language not at all liable to be misunderstood, just so soon as history is ready to set aside the common opinion that the several acts of the British government, from 1764 to 1776, for laying and enforcing taxation in America, did evince a somewhat particular and systematic design to take away some portion of the property of the American people without their consent.

The second of the two great charges contained in the Declaration of Independence, while intimating that some share in the blame is due to the British Parliament and to the British people, yet fastens upon the king himself as the one person chiefly responsible for the scheme of American tyranny therein set forth, and culminates in the frank description of him as "a prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant." Is this accusation of George the Third now to be set aside as unhistoric? Was that king, or was he not, chiefly re-

* "Speech on moving his Resolutions for Concilition with the Colonies," March 22, 1775. "*The Works of Edmund Burke*," ii., 120-121.

sponsible for the American policy of the British government between the years 1764 and 1776 ? If he was so, then the historic soundness of the most important portion of the Declaration of Independence is vindicated.

Fortunately, this question can be answered without hesitation, and in a few words ; and for these few words, an American writer of to-day, conscious of his own bias of nationality, will rightly prefer to cite such words as have been uttered upon the subject by the ablest English historians of our time. Upon their statements alone it must be concluded that George the Third ascended his throne with the fixed purpose of resuming to the crown many of those powers which, by the constitution of England, did not then belong to it, and that in this purpose, at least during the first twenty-five years of his reign, he substantially succeeded—himself determining what should be the policy of each administration, what opinions his ministers should advocate in Parliament, and what measures Parliament itself should adopt. Says Sir Erskine May:

"The king desired to undertake personally the chief administration of public affairs, to direct the policy of his ministers, and himself to distribute the patronage of the crown. He was ambitious not only to reign, but to govern." "Strong as were the ministers, the king was resolved to wrest all power from their hands, and to exercise it himself." "But what was this in effect but to assert that the king should be his own minister ? . . . The king's tactics were fraught with danger, as well to the crown itself as to the constitutional liberties of the people." *

Already, prior to the year 1778, according to Lecky, the king had "laboriously built up" in England a "system of personal government" ; and it was because he was unwilling to have this system disturbed that he then refused,

"In defiance of the most earnest representations of his own minister and of the most eminent politicians of every party . . . to send for the greatest of living statesmen at the moment when the empire appeared to be in the very agonies of dissolution. . . . Either Chatham or Rockingham would have insisted that the policy of the country should be directed by its responsible ministers and not dictated by an irresponsible sovereign."

This refusal of the king to pursue the course which was called for by the constitution, and which would have taken the control of the policy of the government out of his hands, was, according to the same great historian, an act "the most criminal

* These sentences occur in the chapter on the "The Influence of the Crown during the Reign of George III.," in Sir Erskine May's "*Constitutional History of England*," i., 11, 12, 14-15.

in the whole reign of George the Third ; . . . as criminal as any of those acts which led Charles the First to the scaffold."*

Even so early as the year 1768, according to John Richard Green,

"George the Third had at last reached his aim . . . In the early days of the ministry" (which began in that year) "his influence was felt to be predominant. In its later and more disastrous days it was supreme; for Lord North, who became the head of the ministry on Grafton's retirement in 1770, was the mere mouthpiece of the king. 'Not only did he direct the minister,' a careful observer tells us, 'in all important matters of foreign and domestic policy, but he instructed him as to the management of debates in Parliament, suggested what motions should be made or opposed, and how measures should be carried. He reserved for himself all the patronage, he arranged the whole cast of the administration, settled the relative place and pretensions of ministers of state, law officers, and members of the household, nominated and promoted the English and Scotch judges, appointed and translated bishops and deans, and dispensed other preferments in the church. He disposed of military governments, regiments, and commissions, and himself ordered the marching of troops He gave and refused titles, honors, and pensions'. All this immense patronage was steadily used for the creation of a party in both houses of Parliament attached to the king himself . . . George was, in fact, sole minister during the fifteen years which followed; and the shame of the darkest hour of English history lies wholly at his door."†

Surely, until these tremendous verdicts of English history shall be set aside, there need be no anxiety in any quarter as to the historic soundness of the two great accusations which together make up the principal portion of the Declaration of Independence. In the presence of these verdicts also, even the passion, the intensity of language, in which those accusations are uttered, seem to find a perfect justification. Indeed, in the light of the most recent and most unprejudiced expert testimony, the whole document, both in its substance and in its form, seems to have been the logical response of a nation of brave men to the great words of the greatest of English statesmen, as spoken in the House of Commons precisely ten years before :

"This kingdom has no right to lay a tax on the colonies.‡ Sir, I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people, so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest."§

VI.

Thus, ever since its first announcement to the world, and

* Lecky, "*A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*," iv., 457-458.
† "*A Short History of the English People*," 736, 737.
‡ "*The Celebrated Speech of a Celebrated Commoner*," London, 1776, p. 5.
§ *Ibid.*, 12.

down almost to the present moment, has the Declaration of Independence been tested by criticism of every possible kind—by criticism intended and expected to be destructive. Apparently, however, all this criticism has failed to accomplish its object.

It is proper for us to remember, also, that what we call criticism is not the only valid test of the genuineness and worth of any piece of writing of great practical interest to mankind: there is, in addition, the test of actual use and service, in direct contact with the common sense and the moral sense of large masses of men, under various conditions, and for a long period. Probably no writing which is not essentially sound and true has ever survived this test.

Neither from this test has the great Declaration any need to shrink. As to the immediate use for which it was sent forth—that of rallying and uniting the friends of the Revolution, and bracing them for their great task—its effectiveness was so great and so obvious that it has never been denied. During the century and a quarter since the Revolution, its influence on the political character and the political conduct of the American people has been great beyond calculation. For example, after we had achieved our own national deliverance, and had advanced into that enormous and somewhat corrupting material prosperity which followed the adoption of the constitution and the development of the cotton-interest and the expansion of the Republic into a trans-continental power, we fell under an appalling temptation—the temptation to forget, or to repudiate, or to refuse to apply to the case of our human brethren in bondage, the principles which we had once proclaimed as the basis of every rightful government. The prodigious service rendered to us in this awful moral emergency by the Declaration of Independence was, that its public repetition, at least once every year, in the hearing of vast throngs of the American people in every portion of the Republic, kept constantly before our minds, in a form of almost religious sanctity, those few great ideas as to the dignity of human nature, and the sacredness of personality, and the indestructible rights of man as mere man, with which we had so gloriously identified the beginnings of our national existence. It did at last become very hard for us to listen each year to the preamble of the Declaration and still to remain the owners and users and catchers of slaves; still harder, to accept the doctrine that the righteousness and

prosperity of slavery was to be accepted as the dominant policy of the nation. The logic of Calhoun was as flawless as usual, when he concluded that the chief obstruction in the way of his system was the preamble of the Declaration of Independence. Had it not been for the inviolable sacredness given by it to those sweeping aphorisms about the natural rights of man, it may be doubted whether Calhoun might not have won over an immense majority of the American people to the support of his compact and plausible scheme for making slavery the basis of the Republic. It was the preamble of the Declaration of Independence which elected Lincoln, which sent forth the Emancipation Proclamation, which gave victory to Grant, which ratified the Thirteenth Amendment.

We shall not here attempt to delineate the influence of this state paper upon mankind in general. Of course, the emergence of the American Republic as an imposing world-power is a phenomenon which has now for many years attracted the attention of the human race. Surely, no slight effect must have resulted from the fact that, among all civilized peoples, the one American document best known is the Declaration of Independence, * and that thus the spectacle of so vast and beneficent a political success has been everywhere associated with the assertion of the natural rights of man. "The doctrines it contained," says Buckle, "were not merely welcomed by a majority of the French nation, but even the government itself was unable to withstand the general feeling."† "Its effect in hastening the approach of the French Revolution . . . was indeed most remarkable."‡ Elsewhere, also, in many lands, among many peoples, it has been cited again and again as an inspiration to political courage, as a model for political conduct; and if, as the brilliant historian just alluded to has affirmed, "that noble Declaration. . . . ought to be hung up in the nursery of every king, and blazoned on the porch of every royal palace,"§ it is because it has become the classic statement of political truths which must at last abolish kings altogether, or else teach them to identify their existence with the dignity and happiness of human nature.

MOSES COIT TYLER.

* The editor of the latest edition of "*The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*," i., Introd. xxv., does not shrink from calling it "the paper which is probably the best known that ever came from the pen of an individual."

† "*History of Civilization in England*," 846.

‡ *Ibid.*, 847.

§ Buckle, "*History of Civilization in England*," 846.

AFTER THE CORONATION AT MOSCOW.

BY KARL BLIND.

THE stiff Oriental and sacerdotal pomp of the protracted coronation ceremonies in Moscow is over. The sixteen hundred church-bells of that semi-Asiatic city no longer sound together in honor of the monarch who spent a million pounds sterling in hollow festivities. People naturally ask themselves now: What will be the future foreign and home policy of the young "Imperator"?

Under this title, Czar Nicholas II. has been crowned, or rather has crowned himself. As usual, we have heard once more on the present occasion, that Peter the Great for the first time assumed the Imperial dignity in 1721. This is an erroneous statement, however, though made by not a few distinguished historians, and repeated some years ago in Parliament by Lord Beaconsfield (then Mr. Disraeli) in one of his speeches on the Royal Titles bill. As a matter of fact, the title of "Emperor" was claimed and borne at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century by Muscovite rulers. This claim was connected with an old ambition of theirs towards the possession of Byzantium or Constantinople. Owing to the dynastic and civil wars which ravaged Russia after the death of the last descendant of Rurik, the Imperial title fell into disuse under the earlier monarchs of the new princely house of Romanoff. It was Peter I., called the Great, who resumed it in 1721. Before him, Michael Romanoff had declared himself "Autocrat of all the Russias." On this principle of arbitrary self-rule all his successors, male and female, have acted ever since.

As "Autocrat and Imperator," Nicholas II. has now been anointed, at the Cathedral of the Assumption, on the forehead, the eyelids, the nostrils, the lips, the ears, the breast, and the

head, in accordance with the proper traditions of Holy Russia. With the chrism conferred upon him he has received what is called "the seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost," being thus endowed with a kind of divine grace and a supernatural sacramental character. It is true, this holy unction has not prevented many a predecessor of his from meeting with a tragic and ghastly fate. Hence the old saying that "a Czar walks with his father's murderers before, and his own murderers behind him."

The military measures taken at Moscow for the security of the Emperor were on so gigantic a scale as to show what apprehensions had been felt in high quarters in the midst of all the gorgeous festivities. An army large enough for a great power to begin a war of first-rate magnitude with was gathered about the ancient capital, albeit its citizens are the least inclined to political opposition. Nicholas II. is a very young man, just turned twenty-eight. His reign forms, as yet, a white, unwritten page. So, at least, those say who would fain still hope for liberal measures from him. His wife, Princess Alix of Hesse—who, however, according to strict Russian dynastic customs, had to change her name into Alexandra Feodorovna, and her religion from Protestantism to that of the orthodox Eastern Church—is held to be progressively inclined. Nevertheless, such an enormous mass of soldiers were ordered to Moscow as if a foreign invasion had to be repelled by superior force.

This fact is all the more extraordinary because of late the so-called "Nihilist" conspiracies have scarcely given any sign of life. The French Republic, thanks to the new alliance between the Phrygian cap and the knout, has done its best to make its soil insecure for those who fled from the tyranny of Czardom. Among Russian exiles living at Zurich, Geneva and Lausanne, spies have latterly been introduced even in the guise of alleged lady students of the same nationality. In England alone proscribed Russians are free, and in England, partly in consequence of their contact with the quiet operation of parliamentary institutions, partly on account of a change of feeling among the cultured classes of their own country, men like Stepniak, the author of "Underground Russia" and kindred works, who once had a hand in the fierce active fight against Autocracy by all available means of irregular warfare, have gradually ceased to be connected with the organization of so-called terroristic attempts. Their London monthly

organ, *Free Russia*, shows how much they have moderated their demands. If the young Emperor would only consent to the introduction of some kind of representative Assembly, such as all European nations have, and as even the Sultan had adopted shortly before Turkey was beaten down by the armies of Alexander II., the reigning Czar would rally round him many who are at present his adversaries in what is believed to be the camp of the most extreme party.

I first met Stepniak years ago at the house of an English colonel. His profession of political faith then was that of a Republican, with strong Socialist tendencies. "Stepniak," meaning Son of the Steppe, was an assumed author's or pen-name. His real name was Kravtschinsky. He had, no doubt, dropped it on account of his former marked antecedents in what was usually called the "Nihilistic" propaganda.

That word, it may at once be explained, is a somewhat misleading one. It was conferred at first as a nickname. Afterwards it was adopted in a kind of dare-devil mood. It has covered ever since a great many varieties of political and social discontent, as well as of philosophical radicalism. There were "Nihilists" who, from the sheer hopelessness engendered by a tyranny lasting a thousand years, had come to cultivate a philosophy of despair, of disgust, and of destruction, without troubling themselves as to the constitution of the future. These were men that professed a wish to do away with all state organizations for the sake of a morbid individualism—in other words, anarchists. Others there were and are who inclined towards a socialist collectivism in a rather Utopian form. To these latter the name of Nihilist is certainly not applicable. But even men who would have been satisfied with a simple democratic—nay, with a representative—form of government under a kingly head, have often been most ignorantly dubbed Nihilists, simply because they were the resolute foes of autocratic Czardom.

On this point, Stepniak, who was personally in friendly relations with upholders of the Anarchist doctrine, such as Réclus, Krapotkin, and Malatesta, but who was far from sharing their views, wrote about two years ago :

"The so-called Nihilists are not Anarchists. Anarchy died in Russia as long ago as 1874 and was practically buried in 1877. For the last seventeen years there has not been a line published in the Anarchist interest by our

clandestine press; not a declaration of Anarchist views has been made at any of the numerous political trials; not a single manifestation of the existence of that party has occurred within the dominions of the Czar. There are a few Russians who hold Anarchist opinions, but they either keep quiet or come abroad to join the international movement, for there is no field for their activity in their own country. *The Russian people are struggling to obtain a constitutional government, a national parliament, representative institutions.*"

For years Stepniak had repeatedly been one of the speakers on the platforms of London Socialists, who, it need not be said, are also opponents of Anarchism. Latterly, he became more and more moderate in his ideas and aims, so much so that his socialist friends occasionally were rather sore about it. In an interview with him he declared that it would be madness now to strike a blow in the old sense of the party of action. All efforts should be concentrated on getting a legislative assembly. When asked about details of the scheme he avowed that one would have to be content if a Chamber of Deputies were formed on the basis of household suffrage. When he was further asked: "But certainly you would not have an Upper House?" he answered: "Assuredly, we shall have one. At least, that is very possible!"

His interviewer, putting a question as to whether hereditary legislators were meant for the Upper House, Stepniak replied that there were "no men in Russia capable of being such authorities." There were large landowners, but no aristocracy possessing the same influence on the masses as in the United Kingdom. "We must, therefore, do as best we can with a Senate on the American model." To the question as to whether he would entrust the government of Russia to these two Chambers, he replied: "If Russia were as small as Great Britain, we would do so. But Russia is so large that its government must be a Federal one." In other words, he believed in the necessity of a number of Legislatures. At the same time, he distinctly acknowledged that in so compact and homogeneous a state as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland no home rule was required.

Shortly before his sudden death, Stepniak would have been satisfied with a Chamber possessing only a "consultative voice." I have gone into these details because among all Russian exiles he was the most prominent and the most active with his pen. His later views seemed to pave the way to a junction of liberal, democratic, and socialist forces. Up till then they were much

estranged from each other, though all of them aimed at the abolition of the dreary system of oppression under which the more educated classes groan, and which prevents the intellectual standard of the peasantry—the immense mass of the Russian nation—being raised from its degraded condition.

The present time would certainly seem to be the psychological moment for a young monarch to lift the "intelligence" of the country—as the Russian phrase is for the best progressive element of the population—from the Slough of Despond into which it has fallen through hopes of amelioration being ever deferred. In the interest of the personal security of the wearer of the crown himself, it would be advisable to satisfy and quiet those aspirations by admitting their upholders to a share in the government. In a palace revolution Paul I., the mad tyrant, was battered down and strangled. During the reign of his son, Alexander I., who at first was expected to introduce constitutional rule, dangerous conspiracies became rife after it had been seen that he, too, continued the absolutistic system. Nicholas I. had to wade to the throne through blood in 1825, when the capital, as well as some parts of the South, had become the scene of military and popular risings in favor of a constitution. The very existence of the dynasty was, at that time, for several days in grave peril. Towards the conclusion of the Crimean war, Nicholas I. died in a somewhat mysterious manner. No sooner was his life extinct than in a number of Provincial Assemblies there were mutterings and even resolutions which Alexander II. would have done well not to ignore. He did ignore them. The end was that he, who had too long played fast and loose with those who had hoped for a constitution, was torn to pieces by a dynamite bomb. The ghastly event occurred on the very eve (that is, at any rate, the semi-official version) of his intended promulgation of a parliamentary scheme. His son, Alexander III., had practically to live the life of a prisoner, mostly at Gatshina, surrounded by every possible appliance for warding off the approach of assassins. When he ventured away, the railway lines being guarded all along by troops, he yet had to fear and to experience attempts at underground explosions. His life and his consort's life were in one instance most narrowly saved, but not without deep shock to the nervous systems of both. Might not all this have served as a lesson?

As yet it has not. More than a year and a half has Nicholas II. reigned, and no improvement of any importance is visible even in matters not affecting the the autocratic tenure of power. As a Crown Prince he was believed to have a leaning towards progressive ideas, an attitude frequently assumed by heirs-apparent, and to be friendly towards Germany, in opposition to the policy of his father and mother. It was also bruited about that, on account of his former relations with a Polish lady, he would, on his accession, make notable concessions to the Poles and stop religious persecution. In the Baltic Provinces and in Finland it was thought that he would cease continuing those violent measures of Russification against his German and Finnish subjects, which his father had introduced.

None of these hopes was realized. Things went on as usual, or even in a worse manner. The very name of Dorpat—a German name—was taken away from the ancient Baltic town and university, and replaced by the Russian name of "Jurjew." Its university is being Russianized in its teaching staff, to the disgust of both professors and students. In religious affairs the influence of the hated reactionist, Mr. Pobedoniestcheff, remained paramount. Even the treatment of the Jews, which had aroused the indignation of the whole civilized world, at the time of Alexander III., was not altered very much for the better. When a summons was addressed to the representatives of the various religions to come to Moscow for the coronation ceremony, not only the Christian Churches, but also the Mohammedan and some pagan creeds, were included, but the Jews were pointedly left out. It is true this was also so under previous Czars. Only at the last moment, after bitter and satirical remarks had appeared in many foreign papers, this arrangement, by which more than five millions of the Czar's subjects were designedly insulted, was amended in the present case.

Immediately after the accession of Nicholas II., I had a personal experience of the mistrust which, in spite of the more liberal reputation that surrounded his name, existed as to the character of the coming reign. I had made an inquiry, shortly before the death of Alexander III., with regard to the supposed inclinations of his heir. My correspondent, living in a part of the empire which possesses special and somewhat freer institutions than the rest of it, sent me an extensive account—by no

means of an unfavorable but rather of a moderately hopeful nature. When reading it I was somewhat puzzled at first. The whole was drawn up in such a way as to give the idea of the subject treated having not the slightest reference to political and imperial affairs, but rather to those of some private individual. However, not being unused to this sort of correspondence from olden times, I soon discovered the real meaning of the strange missive. Further news has been conveyed to me since, in the same extraordinary garb, but its contents gradually grew less and less hopeful as to the new ruler having any really liberal measures in view.

The Czar's manifesto, dealing with the remission of taxes and the mitigation of sentences pronounced upon prisoners or refugees convicted of common crimes or political deeds, has disappointed even those who had not indulged in over-great hopes. Measures of amnesty are always proclaimed at the accession or the coronation of a monarch. In the present instance the quality of mercy is exceedingly strained. The decree still leaves the political sufferers in Siberia—the victims, in many cases, of sheer administrative arbitrariness—in a most cruel condition. It does not make it possible for any noted Russian exile to return to his fatherland.

This forms a bad outlook. Such as human nature is, one cannot help thinking that, in course of time, the anger aroused by this merciless continuation of the old government practices and by the destruction of all hopes as regards the establishment of some kind of representative institutions, however moderate, will once more lead to violent acts of revenge and intimidation.

In foreign affairs the prospect is not more pleasing. The young Czar, when a Crown Prince, was supposed to entertain feelings of friendship for Germany. Since then he has married a German Princess. Yet the relations with France, which had been heralded in by the naval demonstrations at Cronstadt and Toulon, are still supposed to be such under his reign as to imbue the preachers of "revenge" at Paris with the idea that some day or other they might co-operate with the once hated Cossack. This certainly does not make for peace, nor, truth to say, for the security of the Republic. Men like Gambetta, in whom the Cæsarean vein was so strong, or General Boulanger, who was so near getting into supreme power, will always come up if the

French nation is misled into the expectation of a fresh military adventure with a strong ally at its side. There is a new Orleanist Pretender now to the fore, and the Republic had better watch him.

Though the Russian government may be in no mood to begin a war for the sake of the beautiful eyes of France, or for the object of helping her to the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine, the mere fact of the closer relations between Paris and St. Petersburg perpetuates, and, so far as Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Italy are concerned, unfortunately necessitates, the increase of military and naval forces. It must be remembered that in Russia such increase is ordered by a stroke of the pen. In France all parties are agreed to vote anything government asks for in that direction almost without discussion. Heavy burdens are thus laid upon the populations of central and southern Europe, which are far less able to bear them than wealthier France or despotically governed Russia. Now, the never-ceasing accumulation of what in the end becomes really an easily inflammable material, constitutes a terrible peril both to the prosperity and the peace of the Continent.

The Czar is usually regarded as omnipotent in his vast Empire. Still, it stands to reason that he, too, like other arbitrary rulers, is dependent on court, military, and bureaucratic cliques which gain his ear. He cannot supervise, he cannot ordain, everything. No human frame could stand such strain. In foreign politics, more especially, the main lines of aggressive tendencies in Europe as well as in Asia have for a long time past been laid down under the predecessors of the present Autocrat. And he evidently means, or is made, to follow them, though as yet he has done so without an appeal to arms.

Constantinople and India are manifest aims and objects of Russian policy. Thanks to the imprudence with which Lord Salisbury allowed himself to be led into a trap, in the Armenian question, by Mr. de Nelidoff, the wily Russian ambassador at the Porte, England's old ally has come almost under the protection of the Czar. In the Balkan States, where Bulgaria formerly made a strong stand against Muscovite pretensions, Russia has evidently, since the assassination of Stambuloff, and since Prince Ferdinand's turn towards the Orthodox Church, recovered a good deal of ground. In Asia it has been the steady endeavor of

Russian policy since Peter I. to come nearer and nearer to India. The so-called "Last Will of Peter the Great" is a proved forgery, but the ideas contained therein have mainly guided the course of the Czars for more than a century and a half. By force and fraud and false promises made to England, whenever a new attack was prepared against one of the Central Asian Khanates, Russia has made her way gradually through an immense stretch of territory from the Caspian Sea up to, and even beyond, the frontier of Afghanistan. Ever renewed breaches of the most solemn assurances—occasionally even given to Queen Victoria by a Czar "on the word of a gentlemen"—have been the regularly recurring incidents in these modern "Alexander Expeditions" towards India. For my part I believe that in India England acts the useful part of a guardian of peace between contending races and creeds, as well as a protector of the security of the country against possible attack from the north. She has, moreover, done away, by her legislation, with some of the worst abuses which were the outgrowth of Indian superstition. She has conferred upon multitudes of Indians the boon of a better system of instruction. She has recently made also some honorable efforts in the direction of popular self-rule within her Asiatic Empire. Let the hand of England be withdrawn, and to-morrow the bitter feuds of races and religions would throw India into a sad convulsion. Then, a despotic power, detested by the best intellects in all its own chief cities, would presently step in as a conqueror, with an oppressive military organization, with a host of semi-barbarous hordes as its retinue, and with an administration more corrupt than that of any Oriental tyranny. Could progress thus be furthered?

Yet is it not strange that a fellow-exile of Alexander Herzen—who himself was a preacher of the destiny of Russia to "regenerate the corrupt blood (!) of the Germano-Romanic world"—namely, Iwan Golowin, whom I knew personally years ago, should have written the following, in his "Russia under Alexander II." (Leipzig: 1870):

"Injustice towards a ruler who has so great a task, who bears so heavy a burden, as the Emperor of All the Russias, would be unpardonable, even for an exile . . . But even if I were to say that the Emperor Alexander II. had invented the gunpowder, it would not better my position. I may, at all

events, write this: that he has only entered upon the footsteps of Alexander the Great as far as Samarcand, and that it remains reserved to Alexander IV. *to conquer India.*"

Since that was written Alexander III. has come and gone. Samarcand has long been passed. A new ruler is on the Russian throne, not called Alexander IV., but Nicholas II. That, however, as the French saying is, is merely a detail. Nay, the Russian approach to India has since then been effected also from the Pamir side; and England has not dared to offer any opposition. In vain have there been warnings, for many years, by men who have studied the state of affairs most intimately, such as Sir Henry Rawlinson, Colonel Malleson ("*The Russo-Afghan Question, and the Invasion of India*"), Mr. Charles Marvin, and others. On their part, the most prominent Liberal and Conservative statesmen of England have too often sneered at far-seeing and monitory counsels by speaking airily of "that standing hobgoblin of Russia," "that political nightmare," "that terror of old women," and so forth; meaning the possibility of a close approach to, and a final invasion of, India by the Muscovite Power. One of those statesmen, years ago, satirized the warners by telling them to "buy very large maps, in order to see how far Russia still is from the Indian frontier." To-day he could not repeat that exploded fallacy.

At Constantinople and at Sofia, at Paris and at Pekin, the influence of Russia has latterly made itself felt. The relations she has now with Turkey and China are a distinct damage to the prestige of England. Even the more or less underhand, but very persistent, opposition offered by France to the maintenance of the English occupation of Egypt, has a kind of reserve support now at St. Petersburg. Time will show that, in the East, Russia and England cannot play the part of two kings at Brentford, smelling at one rose. Yet there are English Liberals who have become untrue to the traditions of their party in foreign affairs; misguided Conservatives who have not seen, and will not see, the real aim of Russian policy in the East; and, last but not least, ritualistic High Churchmen who dream of a "unification" of the Russian Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches with their own: all of these parties constituting, so to say, a triple parallelogram of forces in favor of Muscovite aggrandizement. Thus the trend of the situation is towards the

very brink of a great danger, and those who do not live politically from hand to mouth are anxiously watching the signs at the horizon.

KARL BLIND.

Postscript.—On the day after the above had been sent off there came from Moscow the news of the terrible disaster which marred the coronation festivities by a loss of life equal to that of a great battle.

To those who study with an unbiased mind the reports of the ghastly Moscow "crush" and "rout," there is something unspeakably painful in the description of the brutishness and the callousness of the masses of besotted *mujiks*, who, for the sake of a tinsel cup, a sausage, a piece of bread, and a few sweetmeats, trampled each other to death in their hundred-thousands; the survivors coming afterwards back, in the most unconcerned manner, to continue enjoying the sorry amusements offered to them, while heaps of disfigured corpses were still lying about. Next to the horrors of this spectacle of inhumanity, the foreign observer notes the shocking contrast of the uninterrupted festivities at court. Nor can he help being disgusted by the heartless way in which the Moscow journals were made, evidently by government order, to restrict their report of the unparalleled event to a hundred words, couched in the coldest language, without a syllable of sympathetic commiseration.

The barbarousness of the condition of Russia, in spite of the outward glitter of pompous ceremonies, is thus brought home to the slowest understanding. It would be a fortunate day for a nation whose peasantry is so degraded, and whose educated classes are disinherited from all legislative representation, if at last a beginning were made with home reforms in a parliamentary sense, instead of the energy of the country being incessantly used for new territorial conquests and a policy of aggression which in the end may lead to one of those tremendous and sudden collapses not infrequent in Muscovite history. Thousands have, this time, "died for the Czar." Let Nicholas II. beware lest, by persisting in the autocratic course of his namesake and his predecessors, he should bring danger upon the unwieldy empire and provoke for himself the fate of Alexander II.

K. B.

SOME INTERNATIONAL DELUSIONS.

BY THE REV. FRANCIS E. CLARK, D.D., PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR.

IN a peculiarly leisurely fashion the steamers of the *Messageries Maritimes* go circling around the Mediterranean coast from Alexandria to Constantinople, forming numberless little loops as they stop by day to discharge their cargo at some insignificant port, and then sail on when evening comes to the next place of call.

Among my fellow-passengers recently on one of these good but very slow ships, the "Irrawadie," was a little curly-haired English boy, who had evidently been brought up in the strictest sect of the aristocracy—an embryonic Englishman of the Englishmen.

"Do you speak French, little boy?" said a good lady to him, who was trying to scrape acquaintance with the youthful Briton.

"Oh, naow," said the little chap.

"Do you speak American," then asked the lady.

"Oh, naow," he replied with a still stronger emphasis.

"But wouldn't you like to learn American?" persisted the lady.

"Oh, naow, thanks," answered this sturdy little patriot. "It is very, very nahsty to speak American."

The verdict of this terrible infant is the one that would, very likely, be given by many Englishmen and English women of a larger growth. It is taken for granted by a great number of otherwise most intelligent and respectable citizens of the mother country, without any special investigation of what it is to "speak American" or "act American," that it is a "very, very nahsty thing" to do. And it is only fair to say that there is a large class

of Anglophobists on this side of the briny Atlantic who have just as little conception of what it is to speak or act like a cultivated Englishman, and who from the same insufficient data regard it as exceedingly "nahsty," or, as the feminine American adjective would have it, "very horrid."

Little matters of accent and pronunciation too often obscure real kinship and account for many of the lesser delusions.

When in Australia recently I was reminded more than once that my own vernacular bore a remarkable resemblance to the common manner of speech in the English colonies, and I was frequently complimented with the rather faint praise that my audience would "scarcely know that I was an American."

Evidently some of my auditors expected to hear a mixture of the Ojibway, Cherokee, and Micmac dialects, and were scarcely prepared for even a superficial acquaintance with Johnson and Addison.

At the same time my national pride is humbled by remembering that since returning to America I have been asked more than once: "What language do the people of Australia speak?" "Are they all black fellows, or are there some white men among them?"

Even in England, incredible as it may seem, I have had such questions put to me concerning the people of this greatest appanage of the British crown.

While attending a meeting in an English city, a Yorkshireman with a very broad accent, who remarked that he had "coomed all the way from Southern Yorkshire to attend this meeting," made fun of a young American girl from Philadelphia, who remarked that she was "vary glad to be among her English friends." It seemed excruciatingly funny to him that she should say "văry," but there was nothing remarkable in his estimation in the fact that he himself had "coomed" from Yorkshire.

A speaker who followed me at a social gathering in Sydney, New South Wales, remarked by way of good-natured badinage that he should know that I was an American from the way in which I pronounced the word "America." "All you Americans," he went on to say, generalizing very largely, as such speakers are apt to do, "call it 'Murica,' while we Australians speak of the great continent which Columbus discovered as America." The temptation was too great to resist, so, when my turn

came again at this same unconventional gathering, I remarked that, if I was known by my pronunciation of the name of my native country, I should also suspect, wherever I might hear my Sydney friend make an address, that he belonged to the great Island Continent which lies under the Southern Cross; for while we Americans follow Webster and Worcester and Johnson and every other lexicographer in saying "Australia," he put in several additional letters which were not absolutely necessary and called it "Aoustrailia," and that I had noticed that many of my friends in that magnificent capital of the Southern Seas out-English the English themselves in their Cockney pronunciation, since I was frequently asked when I came down to the breakfast table: "How I found myself to-dye, and whether I would like to see the morning paiper?"

In fact, after returning to my native heath from the mother country or any of her colonies, I always feel like remarking, with a famous temperance lecturer who has recently returned from England, that "I have come back with my American accent undenasalized."

But there are other popular delusions which are more vexatious than those which relate to speech or accent. The idea prevails, I have found, very generally in the Old World that all American young people are bold and forward and brassy; that if there is a modest one among them all he is a strange exception, a genuine *lusus naturæ*.

I was gravely informed by a good friend in Australia who thought he knew all about it that he understood that all American girls on the street and in the cars, as well as at home, were constantly chewing gum and expectorating vigorously in every direction.

When I diffidently informed him that I was acquainted with a good many American girls, and that I had yet to see the first one who answered his description of a genuine American damsel, he seemed to think, though he was too polite to say so directly, that I had scarcely kept my eyes open in my own land, or else that I had been blinded by prejudice.

The climate of America also comes in for many maledictions from our friends on the other side of the ocean. In this respect we probably have the worst reputation of any nation on the face of the earth, especially among our forebears in the mother coun-

try. I have no doubt that the dread of the "awfully hot weather," which the English expect to experience in America, deters hundreds, if not thousands, every year from taking the trip across the Atlantic.

At the same time, it must be said in all fairness that our popular conception of English weather, as a dreary mixture of raw winds, penetrating fogs and ceaseless pattering raindrops, is scarcely nearer the truth than the Englishman's opinion of the temperature of America.

"Do you really think that we shall be able to stand your weather without very serious consequences to our health?" was the almost pathetic question of a stout Englishman to me as we neared New York on my last return to America. He looked vigorous enough to shovel coal all day long in a stokehole, or to be an attendant in a Turkish bath, without suffering any serious consequences, but he evidently was in a state of great mental perturbation concerning the awful summer of which he had read and heard so much.

Another cause for alarm among our trans-Atlantic cousins is the dreadful Jersey mosquito. He has been exaggerated by the fears of our friends out of all proportion to fact; and the old threadbare joke, which has such a woodsy flavor of last year's chestnuts about it, to the effect "that the mosquitoes in this country are so large that many of them would weigh a pound, and that they sit on the trees and bark as the people go by," is evidently accepted by many across the seas with only a few grains of salt. "Be sure that you put your petticoat over your head," an Englishman in the steerage said to a female passenger on the voyage to which I have alluded, "when you go ashore at Jersey City, for they do say that the mosquitoes are something terrible, and that they do bite awful."

How much of this ungrammatical warning was humorous and how much serious it was difficult to determine, but it was evidently, in the mind of the one who gave it, "founded on fact," as the short story writers would say.

Many of these extraordinary popular delusions are directly traceable to ignorance and lack of the commonest information concerning America and Americans.

When dining with an Australian friend not many months since I was informed that he had seen in his morning paper a

statement to the effect that there had been a great fire in America. "What city is burned up now?" we said to him, in some alarm. "I can't remember just the place," he replied, "but I think it was Idaho." Our fears were somewhat relieved, for we felt that there might be a considerable fire somewhere among the tens of thousands of square miles of that vast territory without greatly endangering the welfare of the American Republic.

When we get into some of the Eastern countries, of course we find ignorance far more dense and crass than among those who speak our common mother tongue. In Turkey, for instance, one of our missionaries was recently asked in all seriousness whether "America was on a hill or in a valley?" Such hopeless density it is scarcely worth while to attempt to enlighten.

But while we smile at the lack of information exhibited by our cousins across the seas concerning matters that are as familiar as A B C to us, it is not at all improbable that some of us live in a vitreous tenement ourselves. How many bright American youth, who are fresh from their geographies, could name the different counties of England; or could tell whether Leeds and Birmingham were in York or Lincolnshire, Herts, or Kent? Yet very likely these same youth would laugh long and loud if an English cousin should locate Boston in Missouri, or St. Louis in Texas.

When we reach the Antipodes many Americans carry a still more startling and varied stock of misinformation. How many realize that it is a five days' journey across the channel that separates New Zealand from Australia, the two great islands of the Australasian Empire? How many know much about the political situation of Victoria and New South Wales, of Queensland and South Australia? How many can locate the Banda Sea or the Sulu Sea, or tell where the placid waters of the Celebes Sea bask under the torrid rays of the equator? How many realize that it is a railway journey of two thousand miles between Adelaide and Brisbane, and that this little strip of coast constitutes largely the inhabited portion of the Island Continent?

The chief source of these popular delusions is the daily newspapers, on both sides of the Atlantic and Pacific, which cater for the sensational public, who are not content without their horrid list of murders and divorces and railway accidents daily; who

would feel defrauded, as if they had invested two cents in vain, if they did not find in the *Daily Stabber* and the *Morning Sewer* the account of some blood-curdling crime or fearful accident.

Even the most respectable papers seem to find room in their foreign columns chiefly for startling crimes or awful accidents. If a fire-damp chokes a hundred men, if in a railroad accident fifty people "rush into eternity," if a dreadful murder shocks the moral sentiments of five continents, these matters are presented to the public with the abundant emphasis of scare-heads and leaded columns. But the great movements in the political, religious, social, and scientific worlds very slowly find their way into the papers of other lands.

Picking up a London paper once when in England (it was no other than "The Thunderer" itself), the only paragraph of American news which I could find in any part of the voluminous blanket was a statement to the effect that a man had been arrested in Boston for kissing his wife upon the street. Of course, as might be expected, this was a newspaper "fake" which some humorous reporter, for the lack of anything better, had inserted in some American paper. But this was the only piece of news which it had been thought worth while that day to cable under the seas to this great metropolitan journal.

Many an English and Australian friend has said to me: "I should think you would be afraid to travel in America; you always seem to be having such dreadful railway accidents. We scarcely take up a paper without seeing an account of some new horror." Alas, that it cannot be said that the frequency of railroad horrors is a popular delusion, but the fears of my friend were largely exaggerated, because the papers he saw gave him very little else than these accounts of direful railway accidents and other disasters. When I informed him that I had travelled many tens of thousands of miles without meeting a serious mishap or ever being held up by highwaymen, it almost passed his comprehension, and he made up his mind that either the papers which he habitually read or myself had been drawing a long bow.

One of these same friends who entertained these fears, I regret to say, being somewhat soothed by my favorable account of railway travel in the United States, ventured across the Atlantic and

even visited the World's Fair in Chicago. Alas for his temerity! For in the very heart of this land of the free his train was stopped by "road agents," its express car was rifled of its contents and the robbers got off with their booty scot free. What realistic accounts he must have carried home, and how he will corroborate every account of robbery and disaster which he sees in the London papers!

Even such a well-informed paper as *Galignani's Messenger* often contains practical slanders of American public life: not because the individual incidents recorded are not true for the most part, but because they are out of all proportion to other matters of news. The little crime is exaggerated and the great virtue is relegated to an obscure corner, and to small type at that. Last summer that paper contained the announcement that the sentiment against lynching for minor crimes was "beginning to make itself felt to some extent" in America. When one remembers how these horrid outrages are denounced and loathed by the respectable people of America, North and South alike, it makes one's blood hot to read such cold-blooded misrepresentations.

But again it must be confessed that these popular delusions are due quite as much to our own exceedingly sensational newspapers as to anything that is printed in the lands across the seas. The headlines of our average daily, whenever they are read by the people of other lands, would be regarded as proof positive of the worst that can be said concerning the awful state of social life in America. To peruse these papers for a single week would naturally convince any foreigner that America was largely inhabited by thugs and murderers and divorced women and railroad wreckers, while the few who could not be classed in these categories would stand in imminent danger of their lives from some social upheaval or war of the natural elements. The craving for sensations on the part of many of our penny dreadfuls, miscalled newspapers, accounts very largely for these extraordinary and most unpleasant popular delusions concerning America and Americans.

On this side of the Atlantic too, as I before intimated, we are by no means free from our delusions concerning our friends across the waters. We have the general impression that the "Britisher" is a rude and pompous and overbearing man, carrying out in every inch of his stalwart frame the caricature

with which we are so familiar when he is contrasted with tall and lanky Brother Jonathan in our comic newspapers.

The typical John Bull in the eyes of many Americans is this rough and unpleasant creature, whose very name suggests that it is exceedingly dangerous for us to have him in the china-shop of our American feelings and peculiarities. And yet there is probably no part of the world where there is more genuine politeness, or more of that sincere heartiness of character from which all genuine politeness must spring, than in that same Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

That which passes for rudeness in the eyes of the over-sensitive American is often a species of plain-spoken sincerity, combined with a perfectly unconscious assumption that nothing can be quite so good as that which is marked with the British label. In fact, so completely has the Englishman taken this for granted, so entirely beyond all dispute does he regard it, that the most unpleasant characteristic of English life springs from this source. "You speak quite like an Englishman and not like an American at all," was a frequent compliment which I have received, and which I accepted usually with as good grace as possible, though I sometimes made bold to reply: "I speak quite like an American, my good friend, and I should regard it as a good deal more of a compliment if you put it in that way." But this form of kindly commendation which frequently grated on my nerves was simply due to the fact that nothing was considered quite the acme of praise which did not compare the object complimented with the English standard.

I have heard in America very much about British stolidity and undemonstrativeness. This, too, is a very extraordinary popular delusion, for if there is a demonstrative and exuberant people on the face of the earth it is these British brethren of ours. In their public meetings and conventions, whether religious or secular, the speaker is never in doubt concerning their attitude toward him or the questions which he is discussing. Their encouraging "Hear, hear!" ("Yere, yere!" you must call it, if you would be thoroughly *au fait*), their ironical "Oh, oh!" their hearty applause, and the occasional hiss if the sentiments of the speaker do not accord with their views, make it a far more lively and interesting performance to speak to an English audience than to address an assemblage of Yankees,

who always seem to feel that it is a solemn and serious occasion, no matter what the subject of the discourse may be. In Yankee-land the speaker's poor jokes and witticisms and strenuous efforts at pathos or impressiveness are alike unreflected from the impassive countenances of the audience.

The most serious count against these popular misapprehensions is that, while insignificant in themselves, they are really important in preventing the advent of the era of good feeling for which every lover of his fellow men should hope and pray. It is a crying shame that the descendants of the Normans and Saxons and Danes, who have gone out into all the world to found new empires and to people new continents, should know so little of each other, and should often be so wrapped up in their insular or continental prejudices as to hug these popular delusions to their hearts as treasured traditions.

If the peoples of England, America, and Australia knew more of each other, they would love each other far more. International misunderstandings of any serious character would be almost impossible, and war between the peoples who speak the language of Shakespeare would be an undreamed of possibility. English arrogance and American spread-eagleism and Australian provincialism would each receive a deadly blow, if the great branches of the English race but knew each other better, and these extraordinary international delusions would take to themselves wings and fly away.

FRANCIS E. CLARK.

THE STEPCHILD OF THE REPUBLIC.

BY WILLIAM E. SMYTHE.

THE arid region of the United States is a stupendous public property. It is the heritage of the next generation of American citizens. To conquer and subdue it to the uses of civilization will be one of the mighty tasks of the twentieth century. What Africa is to the nations of Europe, Arid America is to the people of the United States—a vast, virgin field which lies open to industrial conquest—the natural outlet for surplus people and capital accumulated in more than two centuries of prosperity.

It is not easy to convey, in a paragraph or a page, a true impression of the size and character of the arid public domain. No other part of this country has been so deeply misunderstood. It has been misunderstood alike from the standpoints of industry and of society, of ethics, and of politics. Nature has written her story upon our arid lands in characters not easily legible to Anglo-Saxon eyes. But it is impossible to comprehend the brood of Western problems involved in any true policy for Arid America without considering at least an outline of certain large facts.

One-third of the total area of the United States is arid, which to the popular imagination means "worthless." And six hundred million acres of this enormous district is still public land over which the authority of the American people is supreme. It is not strange that it is widely believed that this tremendous national possession is almost a misfortune. The region presents an outward aspect totally different from that of the Atlantic seaboard, or from that of the section lying between the Lakes and the Gulf, or from that of the Mississippi basin—which were occupied in three successive eras of settlement without making any peculiar demands upon the knowledge and ingenuity of a race

familiar with European conditions. It is not strange that a people reared in a different environment should think that aridity is a curse, though it is really a blessing; or that the arid region can sustain no important population, though it is fit to support a nation of one hundred millions; or that it cannot develop high forms of industry and society, though it is unquestionably destined to be the seat of a superior civilization. It is a perfectly natural human weakness to imagine that whatever is strange in the face of a country is bad, and that whatever is new and different in the fundamental processes of such an industry as agriculture, for instance, is crude and undesirable.

The word "irrigation," though it relates exclusively to water, is one of the driest words in the English language to those who understand it vaguely as importing a makeshift to remedy the shortcomings of the weather clerk. But irrigation is the foundation of civilization in arid countries. It is yet to become one of the most eloquent and fateful words to the American people. It moulds industry and society into new shapes. It will have much to do with the form and color of political and ethical standards in half a continent. The settler who made a clearing in the Massachusetts forest, or turned the prairie sod in Illinois, proceeded quite independently of his neighbor, and from this original germ of our Eastern population grew the strong individualism which characterizes our dominant commercial spirit. The settler in arid lands cannot grow the first potato, nor the first rose-bush, until he has associated himself with his fellows in the building of an irrigation canal. From this new germ we are to have, and are already having, a strange and hopeful plant which will give different characteristics to the industrial and social fabric of the Far West. What independence these conditions confer upon agriculture; how they regulate the size of the farm unit; how they lead inevitably to the evolution of new principles of commercial association; how they revolutionize the social character of both rural and urban communities—we may learn from the experience of the Mormon commonwealth in Utah, from the institutions in Colorado founded at the instance of Horace Greeley, and from the wonderful conquests over the desert accomplished in California during the last twenty years. What influences these conditions will finally project into the larger fields of

morals and politics, and how these influences will affect the destiny of the American people, are interesting subjects for speculation. It is sufficient for the present purpose to direct attention briefly to these facts and tendencies, to say that a great percentage of the American people will some time live in the arid region, and that the time has come when the nation should have at least the beginnings of a statesmanlike policy to apply to the problems of the vast material heritage that awaits her children.

The present national policy in the arid region is utterly unworthy of the occasion and the opportunity. It is not a policy at all, but a chaos of antiquated and outgrown land laws originally made for a humid region and bodily transferred to a country where natural conditions are precisely reversed. The legislation which suited the public lands of Ohio and Illinois is as useful and sensible in Idaho and California as ice-making machines would be in Greenland. In our profound and well-nigh incorrigible ignorance of our own country and its problems, we are doing unspeakable injustice to the most promising part of the United States, and deliberately saddling incalculable hardship and misery upon future generations. It is when the great West contemplates this wanton neglect of her needs that she sometimes feels that she is the stepchild of the Republic. For she is compelled to wear her sister's cast-off garments regardless of fit or appearance, and regardless of their adaptability to the peculiar conditions of the climate.

The Homestead Law is a misnomer in the arid region. It bids the citizen to go out and maintain himself for a certain period on land which, in spite of its incomparable fertility, can scarcely maintain a prairie dog or a rabbit until it has been artificially watered. The Desert Land Law is even more cruel and grotesque, because it not only bids the citizen to make a home, but to turn the course of a river, and so furnish himself with a complete system of irrigation before he can acquire title. The first law assumes that the new settler can live on climate and sagebrush. The second law assumes that he possesses a cash capital sufficient to start a national bank. Both laws would be jokes if they were not calamities. It is unquestionably true that this legislation was enacted in good faith, and supposedly in the interest of the settler, by the large majority of those whose votes put it upon the

statute book. But it was born of ignorance, and the time has come when it should die of enlightenment. The arid region is now needed as an outlet for a redundant and increasing population. Its potentialities have been demonstrated in a hundred valleys, and there is no longer excuse for delaying the formulation of a policy adapted to the peculiar condition of nearly half of the continent and quite one-third of the United States. The fact that some progress has been made under present laws is due to the supreme attractions of the arid region and to the absolute necessity of a little agriculture to feed other industries. But there can be no great development until the whole system of legislation and administration, as applied to Western resources, is radically reformed. The land laws as they stand to-day make perjury and fraud almost indispensable conditions of progress, or they prohibit progress altogether.

It is true that the Mormons in Utah have had no trouble in building irrigation canals and acquiring lands under the Homestead and Desert Land Laws. This is explained by the fact that with them the church was practically the state; and, so far as purely industrial and commercial affairs are concerned, the Mormon church has been a kind and considerate mother to her children. In their matters of irrigation and settlement, the Mormons have had state control to the verge of socialism. It is also true that in many other parts of the arid region, in narrow valleys where conditions are particularly favorable, farmers have combined their labor and constructed works to water their lands so that they could acquire them in perfect conformity to the law. But the arid lands lie mostly in broad deserts. These can only be reclaimed by costly works. If reclamation is attempted without the absolute control of the land, the capital is almost sure to be lost. Hence, when private individuals or companies build such works they generally seek to obtain control of the land. This can only be done by having "dummies" enter the land under the law, and then transfer it to the company. Land which has been reclaimed by this method cannot be had at government prices and is no longer public land open to entry by citizens. The public land and the public water have been acquired for speculative purposes, and the heritage which Congress intended for the homeseeker is private property, which can only be obtained by the payment of such prices as the private owner

chooses to put upon it. But that is not the worst. In appropriating the water of the public stream, and uniting it with the public land, and then transforming both into the assets of a private speculation, the irrigation company has perfected a new and dangerous monopoly to which the citizen and his descendants are expected to pay tribute, in the form of annual water rental, forever and forever. This is the practical operation of our present land laws. It impoverishes the nation without enriching the investor ; for the people will seldom pay the high prices demanded, nor will they live in peace with the water-lord when they have become his subjects. The whole system is a scandal and a disgrace to the American name. It is not worthy to be compared with the system which existed in China and Egypt a thousand years before this continent was discovered.

Our present methods are no better adapted to the requirements of forest and pasturage lands, nor to those of interstate and international rivers, than to the irrigable domain. Our so-called policy of forest "reservations" is a mockery. It is a reservation which does not reserve. It is a name without the faintest semblance of force behind it. The forests are precious not only for timber, but yet more in their relation to the water supply. They are nature's storage reservoirs. In permitting them to be wantonly destroyed by fire and axe we are devastating great and potentially fruitful valleys for all time. Men who would scorn to steal an armful of sticks from their neighbor's wood pile do not hesitate to commit wholesale larceny upon the nation's forests. But the firebrand is worse than the thief, and our present laws and administrative system, if it can be dignified by the phrase, are perfectly impotent in the presence of both.

Much the larger portion of the public domain consists of grazing lands. These we treat as a public common. Here the Indian has been succeeded by white men more savage than he. Sheep-men and cattle-men struggle for supremacy, fighting and shedding blood in the never-ending contest for possession of property which belongs to neither. The troops are ordered out occasionally to separate the combatants, but when this has been temporarily accomplished the beneficent nation rests from its labors. In the absence of any scientific determination of the boundary between irrigable and grazing lands, the settlers and the stockmen settle it among themselves according to the relative

amount of their ammunition. In the meantime, we are industriously engaged in civilizing harmless Indians.

Our present laws make no provision for the division and control of interstate and international waters. The condition of the arid region in this respect is little less than pitiable. But the entanglements and dispute which have thus far arisen from this source are as nothing to the troubles which will arise in the future not only between states, but between nations as well. The most grievous instances at present are concerned with the waters of the Arkansas, the Rio Grande, and the Platte. Colorado claims the right under her Constitution to use every drop of water that falls upon her soil. In utilizing this right, she deprives portions of Kansas and New Mexico of water which has flowed through their territory in natural channels for ages. New Mexico, in her turn, perpetrates a similar injury upon old Mexico, our sister republic on the south. In several instances costly irrigation works in the lower states have been rendered utterly worthless, while large tracts of land which could be made fruitful remain uncultivated because deprived of their natural water supply. It is startling to contemplate the ultimate extent of the troubles which may arise over the control and distribution of interstate waters. A few years ago an engineering genius made a map of Arid America as it would appear if States had been laid out in accordance with the watershed. He found it was very feasible indeed to reconstruct the entire political system of the West—on paper—in a way which would forever dispose of the knotty problem of conflicting rights to interstate streams. But he discovered that a scientific division of this sort would make twenty-six states out of the present fourteen states and three territories. The objection to the influx of twenty-four new Western senators, to say nothing of the social, commercial, and political disarrangement in a local way, would, of course, be fatal to such a solution of the problem, if seriously proposed. But the dangers of civil and economic conflict involved in the present situation is one of the strongest arguments in favor of the adoption of an enlightened national policy.

What policy has been proposed as a substitute for the present chaos of laws and impotence of administration in the arid region? But one solution has been offered with the slightest prospect of success. This is the cession of all the arid lands,

except mineral lands, to the states in which they lie. This plan has been repeatedly indorsed by the trans-Mississippi Congress and other Western bodies. But many who have favored it in the past now gravely hesitate to press the proposition at a time when it apparently has the support of the national administration and many powerful newspapers. The truth is that the plan of cession has been the policy of desperation. When Western men have seen, on one hand, the utter imbecility of present laws, and, on the other, the stolid indifference of the East to the needs of intelligent legislation, they have cried in despair: "Turn the lands over to us and we will solve our own problems." And the ready response of many Eastern public men and newspapers has been: "Take your worthless lands and give the country a rest." But against the plan of cession there has always been a protesting minority in the West which has not dared to trust to the wisdom and integrity of the States in a matter involving public property which represents a potential value of billions of dollars. This minority has also insisted that the problems of the arid region are national in their essence, and involve so many questions which transcend the boundaries of States that nothing less than the federal power itself can deal with them satisfactorily. Even the advocates of cession have conceded that the true statesmanlike solution would be a great national policy, under which federal authority should be associated with the powers of the several States in adjusting the intricate questions at issue and in making homes for millions of American citizens.

During the past two years events have occurred which put a new face on the whole question. These events are the passage by Congress of the "Carey law," donating to each of the desert States one million acres of arid land under certain conditions; and, second, the evident and gratifying growth of popular interest in Arid America and its institutions on the part of the country at large. Senator Carey's bill was a very happy inspiration. It satisfied those who had faith in the plan of cession without alarming those who were afraid of the plan. One million acres are a very small drop out of a very large bucket, and yet this grant suffices as a means of showing what the States can do for themselves. It leaves unsettled the question of the forests, of the grazing lands, and of interstate streams; but it furnishes a substitute for the Homestead and Desert Land laws and an

ample outlet to accommodate the present demands of surplus population. The Carey law was enacted in August, 1894, and formally accepted by the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, Montana, and Nevada during the legislative sessions of 1895. And the laws which the States enacted in connection with the acceptance of the grant were for the most part such as to justify the confidence of those who had believed in the ability and honesty of the State governments. These laws generally provided for State engineering departments to develop scientific plans of reclamation; for fixing the maximum price at which lands could be sold; and, most important and hopeful of all, for the transfer of the irrigation works to the landowners as fast as districts are settled. Much work is being done under the "Carey law" and the only complaint which has arisen under it is of restrictions which make it difficult to use the lands as the basis of securities issued for the purpose of raising money to construct works. The issue of such securities is not inconsistent with the spirit of the law and ought not to be with its letter. The remedy is to make the cession of the million acres absolute rather than conditional. The State should be trusted with full responsibility in connection with this comparatively small amount of land. In no other way is it possible to make the law a real test of the principle involved.

But although the Carey law has relieved the situation, it has not cured it. The true interest of the arid region and of the nation demands the application of a comprehensive policy, based on scientific and practical knowledge of all the diverse interests involved in these Western problems. Such a policy cannot be framed in a day or a year. But there are three steps which might be taken without delay, and which would prevent the further dissipation of national resources, while providing means toward a final solution. These steps are as follows:

1. Make the donation of one million acres to each of the States absolute and unconditional, so that the policy of State control of irrigable lands may be fairly tested.

2. Repeal the Homestead and Desert Land laws, and thus prevent the further acquirement of public lands for private speculation.

3. Appoint a National Irrigation Commission, composed of men especially fitted by training and experience for the under-

taking, and charge this commission with the work of studying the whole problem of the arid region, including forests, pasturage and agricultural lands, interstate and international streams. Let this commission consider how far the nation must co-operate with the States in developing the great public property represented by the arid region, and in making it the basis for the future settlement of millions of American citizens, and the seat of a wonderful industrial and social life.

The lands granted to the States under the Carey law will furnish an ample outlet for surplus population for the next five years. And, if this period is wisely used for the investigation and discussion of future policies, the dawn of the twentieth century will find Arid America in a position to sustain its part in the future growth of the United States. It is difficult to conceive of a single worthy objection to the moderate programme involved in the steps suggested. It calls for no large expenditure; it does no injustice to settler or investor; it does not plunge the nation into any headlong course from which it cannot retreat. It merely recognizes the existence of a rising national problem, and looks to its solution in time to meet the national need. It is such a plan as foreign statesmen have applied repeatedly and successfully when they have been dealing with undeveloped resources of vast ultimate value and importance.

It has been the fashion of certain Eastern newspapers to dispose of our great Western States and Territories with a sneer. Though these contain larger populations than did most Eastern States at the time of their admission to the Union, they are condemned as "rotten boroughs." Though the wealth of their natural resources is as ten to one compared with most Eastern States, they are treated as if they had no capabilities of future growth. The truth is that the most conservative authorities agree that Arid America can readily sustain as many people as now live in the entire Republic. But this mighty section is helplessly bound by a legacy of incongruous laws. The newspapers which assail and criticise it do nothing to assist in relieving it of its incubus. If half the energy used in criticism and arraignment were expanded in a generous effort to solve the problems of the West, several of the stock political epithets of the time would speedily become obsolete. It would seem as if the resources of our own country ought to be at least as interesting to

our own people as the shadowy issues of Venezuela, South Africa, and the North Pole. But they receive far less attention in Congress, in the newspapers, and in the magazines.

The seventeen splendid States and Territories of the arid region should no longer be treated as step-children of the Republic. They are legitimate and self-respecting offspring of the mother nation—as much as Massachusetts, or New York, or Pennsylvania. They will do their equal share to earn the family living and to glorify the family name. Nature planned them on nobler lines than most of their elder sisters. All they require is a little intelligent attention and a little genuine good will. If this can be given before it is too late, Arid America will become the most hopeful and interesting ground in the United States during the next century. No fairer opportunity for material conquest awaits any other nation, or any other part of the world.

WILLIAM E. SMYTHE.

A COMMON COINAGE FOR ALL NATIONS.

BY THE HON. CHARLES W. STONE.

STEAM and electricity have largely removed the barriers of time and space which separate nations. As the facilities for easy and rapid communication increase, the relations of different nations become more intimate, their commercial transactions with each other multiply, and the solidarity of the interests of all becomes more evident. Co-operation and reciprocal aid between nations by treaty covenants, by international conventions and conferences, by postal, telegraphic, and other unions, have with each passing year brought the nations of the world closer together. Laws are assimilated, customs are changed, and we are rapidly realizing the wisdom of the great Napoleon's declaration at St. Helena that what the world needs is "a common law, a common measure, and a common money."

A "common law" can never fully reach down to local regulation and restraint while nations remain independent, but increasing knowledge of each other and the more cordial relations that come with easier, quicker, and more frequent communication will constantly tend to uniformity; and, above all, a common law applicable to nations as to individuals, a perfected and enlarged international law declared and administered by a great international court of arbitration, enforced by the compact of nations, which shall end wars and rumors of wars and usher in the era of universal peace, is also a dream of the philanthropist that may yet be realized.

A "common measure" has already spread over most of the civilized world, and the probable adoption of the metric system of weights and measures in the near future by the United States, Great Britain, and Russia will make that system universal and save

much of the friction and loss which have heretofore been the outcome of diverse systems.

A "common money," the means and measure of every exchange and business transaction, is still unrealized. It was said many years ago by Senator Sherman to have been the "hope of philosophers and statesmen, and the demand of writers on political economy for centuries," but progress toward its attainment has been halting and slow.

France, in the forming of the Latin Union, and in the calling of international conferences to consider the subject, has labored zealously toward that end. The United States has never been indifferent. At the commencement of her national existence she sought to replace the various colonial systems then existing by a national coinage, and to secure uniformity through all the States she placed in the Constitution the express and broad prohibition that "no State shall coin money." The earliest to adopt a consistent and complete decimal system well adapted to universal use, she has never sought to force it on other nations, but has always realized the advantages of an international currency and stood ready to yield national pride and convenience to its attainment. In 1857, by direction of Congress, a special representative of this government was sent to England to urge uniformity of coinage between the two nations, but without result. The great finance minister of our war period, Secretary Chase, in his first report to Congress, called attention to the desirability of an international system ; and, in his second report, he again brought the matter to the attention of Congress and advocated the reduction of our half eagle to the value of the English sovereign, as a first step in the movement. Later, at the international conference of 1867, the United States, through their representative, assented to a still greater reduction of our half eagle, so as to make it equal twenty-five francs, if by that means a common coin could be secured. The movement then so zealously pressed, which at one time promised practical results, failed, largely from the fact that some of the nations whose co-operation was essential were on a silver basis, some on a gold basis, while some had a double standard, and the distinct and diverse interests arising from this condition of things made union on a common basis practically impossible. To this should be added something of national jealousy, rivalry, and pride; something of the inertia of firmly

seated custom, which held England back from adopting anything distinctively French.

Since then nearly thirty years have passed. Conditions have changed. Men's ideas have "broadened with the progress of the suns." All the leading commercial nations have now the same monetary standard. The main problem is stripped of the complications arising from collateral considerations.

Why should the nations endure longer the inconvenience and loss, the waste of time and labor incurred in making conversions from the money terms of one nation into those of others, with the further loss of exchange rates, the fees of money changers, and the cost of reminting the coins of one nation into those of others? Why not have at least a common money of account if not of circulation, a common denominator in which can be expressed invoice values, market quotations, and all transactions of international interest? The money of account should be and speedily would be money of circulation, but not necessarily or probably the only money of circulation. In the United States the money of account is simply dollars and cents, while the money of circulation embraces nickels, dimes, quarters, and half dollars, quarter eagles, half eagles, eagles, and double eagles. We speak of halves, quarters, and dimes; but we compute these only as cents. We handle eagles and double eagles; but we add, subtract, multiply, and divide them only as dollars. So an international coin would not necessarily nor probably displace the distinctive coins of the different nations, but these should be made even multiples or sub-multiples of the common coin, so that computations might be simple and easy; and probably in time they would lose their distinctive names and be designated as multiples or fractions of the common denominator or international unit. This would not come at once; it might never be fully attained; it would likely come more rapidly and completely in some nations than in others, according to the measure of their versatility and progressiveness and the extent of their foreign travel and commerce; but the probabilities are that such coinage would be eagerly sought, and for a time more or less hoarded. A coin known to be of unchanging value everywhere, behind which was the allied faith of many nations, itself a sort of emblematic expression of the brotherhood of man and of the growing unity of peoples, would possess a combined practical and sentimental

attractiveness which would overcome national exclusiveness and partiality for national things and make it in the end the measure and medium of all exchanges, except the smallest and most distinctively local and provincial.

But, even if the international coin were never struck at any mint, but simply its character as a common unit and its value definitely fixed and the coins of each nation made to correspond with it by even multiplication and division, get the adoption of such a common denominator, into and out of which the values of every country should be easily and evenly convertible, would be an immense advantage and convenience in international exchange and commerce.

We may assume it to be, I think, beyond dispute that a common coin of uniform value, current without discount in all the principal nations, would be a great convenience alike to the traveller, the merchant, the business man, the investor, and all who mingle in the broader affairs of life; and, if in its terms could be expressed all invoices, market quotations, and statistical returns, the store of knowledge of every people would be largely augmented, and the facilities for intelligent business transactions greatly increased. The value of the time saved which is now spent in figuring the conversions from the terms of one country to those of another cannot be estimated; but, when we reflect that the external commerce of the world, the aggregate of exports and imports, for 1893, is estimated at $17,500,000,000, we realize something of the inconvenience and loss attending the conversion of this almost incredible sum into and out of different monetary systems. The aggregate amount paid in discounts and exchange in passing from one system to another is also beyond calculation, and is a total loss so far as productive results are concerned.

The useless expense and waste in melting the coins of one nation only to transmute them into those of another could probably be approximately ascertained, but it is sufficient for present purposes to indicate the extent of such recoinage. In the last three years, recoinage has been carried on to the greatest extent probably by Germany and Austria-Hungary, and the following figures from the last report of the Director of the Mint will be of interest.

Germany reports that in 1894 there were furnished to the

mints, to be recoined into German gold coin, 22,128 and $\frac{9244}{10000}$ pounds fine of foreign gold coin. In 1893, Austria coined 866,324 florins from domestic gold coin, and 80,716,644 florins from foreign gold coin. In 1894, she coined 1,642,534 florins from domestic gold coin, and 28,219,465 from foreign gold coin. In 1893, the United States melted down and recoined foreign gold coins to the amount of $12,518,764.88, and foreign silver coins to the amount of $1,087,835.05.

To the saving of the unnecessary cost of recoinage should be added a material saving of loss from abrasion. This is largely avoided in our domestic circulation by the use of paper representatives of coin, but careful investigations in England, made a few years ago, showed that the coinage loss by abrasion on the sovereigns in circulation was on the average over one-half of one per cent., and on the half-sovereigns double as much; and that 31½ per cent. of the English sovereigns in circulation had thus been reduced below the weight which makes them legal tender. In 1893, $670,000,000 of gold and $578,000,000 of silver were moved between different countries, involving such loss by abrasion as was consequent thereon. International coinage would dispense with much of this transportation; and if to that there were added the issue of international certificates of coin deposits, much after the manner of our system of gold and silver certificates, most of the transportation of coin from nation to nation would be avoided. Such certificates, based on the deposit of international coin, and issued under proper treaty regulations, would accomplish much of the advantage, perhaps all that is practicable, of an international clearing house to adjust the balances of national obligations.

Passing by the vast effect of the use of checks and drafts, we may say that increased facilities and rapidity of transportation have largely increased the exchange power of the world's stock of money; and the adoption of a common system of coinage, with auxiliary coin deposit certificates, would still further greatly increase the effectiveness of the present stock of the world's money metals for currency purposes.

A union of nations on a common system of coinage would render practicable and probably advisable the imposition of a small but uniform mintage charge, which would operate to retain in coin form, and hence for currency uses, all coins struck. The melting of coin for use in the arts and industries

now so largely carried on, the amount of which can never be definitely ascertained, would thus be rendered unprofitable and expensive and would cease. The work and expense of coinage would thereafter not be wasted, the coins once struck would remain exclusively for money uses, and much more accurate estimates of the amount thereof in circulation could be made. The imposition of such a mint charge has been generally approved by political economists; but, in the rivalry and strife of nations bidding against each other for the world's production of precious metals, it has not been practicable.

A coinage resting on national compact would be not only universal in character, but also stable and permanent. The tendency of individual nations to change and generally to debase their coinage seems irresistible. During this century the United States has not only changed the fineness of the metal in her coins of silver and gold, but has reduced the weight of gold in all her gold coins and of silver in all her subsidiary coins. Germany has just completed a radical change in her coinage. England, by various changes, has reduced the pound sterling from the weight of a pound of silver in the time of William the Conqueror to 3 oz. 12 dwt. 16 grs. at the present day. The German florin dropped by successive changes from the value of $2.40 to forty cents. The French livre, once worth $18.50, and containing a pound of silver, came in time to contain only nineteen cents' worth of silver. Such changes could hardly happen if they could only be made with the concurrent assent of many nations.

While the larger nations of the world maintain distinctive and different coinage systems, the smaller, the less enlightened, and the non-coining nations recognize the one or the other system or maintain their own, as their tastes, interests, or whims may dictate, the result being a coinage mixture of dubious character and uncertain value. A common coin of the great nations would inevitably become the coin of the smaller nations, through the forces of trade and use, if not of formal adoption. The tendency in this direction is shown by the adoption of the French system by so many of the smaller nations of Europe and of Central and South America. Its decimal character, and the prestige of its adoption by the Latin Union, with the aggressive but diplomatic urgency of the French, have carried it so far into general acceptance as to make its adoption in outline, if not in detail, not only

a matter of speculative and theoretic interest, but a question of practical importance, likely in the not very distant future to demand careful consideration.

In the time of Cæsar Augustus, the world had practically a common money; but the breaking up of the Roman Empire, and the wars that followed, individualized the nations in many of their customs, their weights, measures, coins, and money terms. War isolates peoples and sharply defines not only physical boundaries but national characteristics, customs, habits, and appliances. A favorite expression of sovereignty and independence was found in the creation of distinctive coins and currencies by different tribes and nations. Hence, in the passage of centuries and through the growth of nationalities, came the multifarious monetary systems now in existence. They were the outgrowth of an era of strife and war, when international communication took place mostly on the battle-field, and international exchanges were mainly the blows of conflicting armies.

We are now in an era of peace, of trade, of general progress, of common enterprise, of easy and constant intercourse, social and commercial, of widening cosmopolitan ideas, of lessening national prejudices. Natural barriers to communication and intercourse are being surmounted or annihilated. Why should those which are purely artificial be allowed to remain?

Conceding, as perhaps all will do, the desirability and importance of a common standard coinage among nations and the many advantages that would come from its adoption, we are confronted with the problem: How shall it be attained? To determine that, we may first inquire what are its essential requisites?

We may say without hesitation that such coin should be of uniform fineness of metal. The coins of Great Britain are $\frac{11}{12}$ fine; of the United States, France, and Germany, $\frac{9}{10}$ fine. Some nations drop below this grade of fineness for their subsidiary coins: others rise above it with their gold coins. A uniform degree of fineness would be essential for a common coin, and experience has demonstrated that the rate of $\frac{9}{10}$ fine, which is most nearly universally accepted now, is best for coinage purposes. It is not likely that any difficulty would be encountered in agreeing on that.

Such coin should be of uniform size and weight. It might properly have on one side a common device or legend, and on

the reverse the emblems or legend of the nation issuing it. It should be issued under uniform regulations, and at a common mintage charge.

All these requisites could be attained through an international mint, supervised by and managed under the directions of representatives of all the nations joining in the compact, sustained in some such way as is the International Bureau of Weights and Measures; its perfect neutrality being guaranteed by the common agreement. Or each nation at its own mints might coin the international coin under such regulations and restrictions as might be fixed by treaty. When this is done, no limitation on the amount of gold coinage need be fixed.

For a coinage from silver, further conditions and agreements would be necessary. A common ratio must be agreed upon, and under existing conditions a limitation on the amount of silver coinage by each nation, with definite agreements for redemption on demand by the country issuing it, either in gold or in other coin of the country demanding redemption, would be indispensable. It will thus be seen that the adoption of an international silver coin is confronted with more practical difficulties and perplexities than the adoption of a common gold coinage, but these are not necessarily insurmountable. An international conference, that brought to its work intelligence, patience, and a liberal spirit, ought to succeed in outlining a system which should embrace both gold and silver coinage under conditions and restrictions that would ensure safety.

An international coinage might consist of gold alone, but if made to embrace silver also, it would be more universal in its character. It would then commend itself to the approval and adoption of silver-using nations and widen the use of silver, and probably tend to a gradual enhancement of its value and, possibly, ultimately to the restoration of its parity with gold on an agreed ratio. If such a result should come as a consequence of concurrent action by the great nations of the world, as the outgrowth of their united wisdom and prudence, it would come with entire safety and with beneficial results.

It might be added that, while the international coin should be legal tender in every nation joining in the compact, its convenience and practical usefulness might probably be increased by providing for the issue by each nation of certificates of deposit

of such international coin, to be received in all other nations under the same conditions as apply to the acceptance of the coin deposited. This is not an essential feature of a common system, but is an American idea engrafted on our domestic currency system that is worthy of due consideration in connection with an international system. Its adoption would tend to diminish greatly the necessity of shipment and transportation of coin, and to simplify national exchanges.

The practical difficulty in the way of an international agreement lies in the attachment of each nation to its own system, terms, and coins. Which shall yield to the other, or whether all shall yield to a new and symmetrical system, are questions which open up too broad a discussion for the limits of the present article, and which can only be decided by international conference and agreement. It may be said, however, in brief, that the unit adopted should be expressed in the singular number. The aggregate value of a number of existing units, as, for instance, five francs, may be adopted if necessary; but that value, if it is to be received as the unit of a new monetary system, should be designated by a name in the singular number, and not by one that shows it to be the multiple of another or sub-unit. The franc is too small, the sovereign too large for such unit. The dollar is of convenient size, and is known over most of the world. Make the dollar conform in value to five francs, or to one-fifth of a sovereign, if necessary, but let it be the unit of an international monetary system. The change of its value, if made, might occasion temporary inconvenience and necessitate cautionary legislation protective of vested interests; but the trouble would be insignificant compared with the vast benefits to be derived from a universal world's coinage. A currency that would change value at no national frontier, that would defy the exactions of brokers and money-changers, that would carry the badge of civilized life into every clime, exchangeable for the products of every tribe and nation, the measure of all labor and value, uniform, universal, and unchangeable, is a desideratum the attainment of which is worthy the most zealous efforts of the patriotic citizens of every nation.

CHARLES W. STONE.

THE TEACHER'S DUTY TO THE PUPIL.

BY HIS EMINENCE, CARDINAL GIBBONS.

THE importance of the subject briefly treated in this article may be estimated by the host of teachers and scholars. The teachers of the United States are numbered by tens of thousands, while the pupils, ecclesiastical and secular, frequenting public and private schools, colleges and academies, reach several millions.

The progress that these scholars make in their studies, largely depends on the intelligence, diligence and capacity of the teachers.

Plutarch, in a letter to his former pupil, the Emperor Trajan, says: "I am sensible that you sought not the Empire. Your modesty, however, makes you still more worthy of the honors you had no ambition to solicit. Should your future government be in keeping with your former merit, I shall have reason to congratulate both your virtue and my own good fortune on this great event; but if otherwise, you have exposed yourself to danger and me to obloquy; for the faults of the scholar will be imputed to the master. Only continue to be what you are. Let your government commence in your breast; and lay the foundations of it in the command of your passions. If you make virtue the rule of your conduct and the end of your actions, everything will proceed in harmony and order. I have explained to you the spirit of those laws and constitutions that were established by your predecessors, and you have nothing to do but to carry them into execution. If this should be the case, I shall have the glory of having formed an Emperor to virtue; but if otherwise, let this letter remain a testimony to succeeding ages, that you did not ruin the Roman empire under pretence of the counsels or the authority of Plutarch."

From the words of Plutarch we may draw this important lesson, that the moral precepts of the teacher will exercise but little influence on the scholar, unless they are enforced by his own example. But if his life is in harmony with the instructions which he inculcates, they will make a deep and lasting impression on the heart of his pupil. For if the edifying demeanor of those whom we casually meet in the walks of life is a stimulus to virtue, how potential for good, and how enduring is the exemplary conduct of the professor who is the official guide of our susceptible youth!

Every one admits the truth of the Horatian axiom that persons are more deeply affected by what they see than by what they hear. If this maxim can be affirmed of all men, how much more forcible is its application to the impressionable scholar!

The pupil's character is almost unconsciously formed after the model of his instructor. The impression produced on the youthful mind, by the tutor's example, has been happily compared to letters cut in the bark of a young tree which deepen and broaden with time.

Of our excellent teachers, we can say in the words of John Sterling:

> "Ever their phantoms rise before us,
> Our loftier brothers, but one in blood;
> By bed and table they lord it o'er us,
> With looks of kindness and words of good."

The institution, in which a man studies, is supposed to exert so dominant an influence in moulding his character, that his *Alma Mater* is as sure to be mentioned by his biographer as the parents from whom he sprang.

So close, indeed, and tender and far-reaching are the relations subsisting between the teacher and his pupils, that the master feels honored by the virtuous and distinguished career of his scholar, while he has a sense of personal humiliation should the pupil's record prove dishonorable and scandalous. Harvard or Yale, Princeton or Georgetown, is eager to claim as her son the statesman, the jurist, or the man of letters who chanced to have drunk at her fountain of knowledge. Oxford would have gladly erected within her walls a monument to her peerless son, Cardinal Newman, had she not been thwarted by unreasoning bigotry. In like manner, our ecclesiastical colleges and seminaries refer

with commendable complacency to their alumni who have distinguished themselves as priests or prelates in the paths of science and virtue. As Cato, in his old age, pointed with pride to the widespreading trees that his hands had planted in early manhood, so will the venerable teacher contemplate with admiration every fresh blossom or fruit that enriches the living tree reared and cultivated in his nursery of learning.

But while the preceptor enjoys the reflected honor that beams on his favored scholar, public sentiment makes him share, in some measure, though often unjustly, the odium attached to a pupil whose public life has been stained by unworthy conduct. The good name of Quintilian was marred by the vicious conduct of some of his scholars. The reputation of Seneca suffered on account of the crimes of Nero, his former pupil. The reproach seems, however, to be unmerited, for, as long as the young prince followed the instructions and counsels of his preceptor, he was loved by the Roman people; but when he fell into the hands of other masters, he became the shame of the human race. The exterior gravity and propriety of Seneca were a continual censure on his pupil's vices.

The professors of our colleges and seminaries should be profoundly impressed with the dignity and grave responsibility of their position. They are the constituted guardians of their pupils *in loco parentis*. It should be their constant aim that the lustre of the jewels confided to their keeping be not dimmed by neglect, but that they reflect more and more the brightness of the Sun of Justice. "What is more noble," says St. John Chrysostom, "than to form the minds of youth? He who fashions the morals of children performs a task, in my judgment, more sublime than that of any painter or sculptor." In contemplating the magnificent works of art exhibited in the churches of Rome, we extol the great masters who produced them, and we know not which to admire more, the paintings and statues which adorn St. Peter's Basilica, or the temple itself in which those masterpieces are enshrined. But the teacher, in moulding the character of the youths committed to his care, is engaged in a pursuit far more worthy of our admiration. He is creating living portraits destined to adorn, not only our earthly temples, but also the temple of God in heaven "not made by hands."

The professor who would aim at shaping the character of all

his students according to one uniform ideal standard, would be attempting the impossible, because he would be striving to do what is at variance with the laws of nature and of nature's God. In all the Creator's works, there is charming variety. There are no two stars in the firmament equal in magnitude and splendor, "for star differeth from star in glory;" there are no two leaves of the forest alike, no two grains of sand, no two human faces. Neither can there be two men absolutely identical in mental capacity or moral disposition. One may excel in solid judgment, another in tenacity of memory, and a third in brilliancy of imagination. One is naturally grave and solemn, another is gay and vivacious. One is of a phlegmatic, another of a sanguine temperament. One is constitutionally shy, timid and reserved; another is bold and demonstrative. One is taciturn, another has his heart in his mouth. The teacher should take his pupils as God made them, and aid them in bringing out the hidden powers of their soul. If he tries to adopt the leveling process by casting all in the same mould, his pupils will become forced and unnatural in their movements; they will lose heart, their spirit will be broken, their manhood crippled and impaired.

"I will respect human liberty," says Monseigneur Dupanloup, "in the smallest child even more scrupulously than in a grown man; for the latter can defend himself against me, while the child cannot. Never shall I insult the child so far as to regard him as material to be cast into a mould, and to emerge with a stamp given by my will."

Instead of laboring to crush and subdue their natural traits and propensities, he should rather divert them into a proper channel. The admonition which would be properly administered to a sullen or obstinate youth deliberately erring, might be excessive, if given to one of an ardent or sensitive nature acting from impulse or levity.

One day, an abbot of some reputation for piety, was complaining to St. Anselm about the boys who were being educated in the monastery. "Though we flog them continually," said he, "yet they become worse." "And," queried St. Anselm, "how do they turn out when grown to be young men?" "Stupid and dull," answered the abbot. "At that rate," exclaimed the saint, "the system you employ is a model one for stunting intellectual growth. My dear abbot, suppose you were to plant a tree in your

garden and shut it in on all sides so that it could not shoot forth its branches, what might you expect save a twisted, tangled, and worthless trunk ? Now, by enslaving the spirit of children, by leaving them no liberty of action, you foster in them narrow, vicious, and wicked propensities, which, growing stronger day by day, resist every effort to change and eradicate them. Finding, moreover, that you are neither kind nor amiable, they will put no confidence in you ; they will believe that you are moved by motives of dislike and envy. These inclinations increase with their years, and their minds and hearts grow bent to vice. Devoid of Christian charity, their views of the world and of life become utterly distorted. Now, tell me, were you in the place of these boys, would you be pleased with such treatment as you give them ? "

The abbot threw himself at the feet of St. Anselm, admitted his lack of tact and discretion, and promised amendment.

Jesus Christ is the model Teacher. His conduct toward His disciples is the best example to be followed. He did not attempt to quench their natural spirit, but He purified and sanctified it in the fires of Pentecost. After Peter had graduated in the school of his Master, he remained the same ardent man that he had ever been. His vehement energies were expended, however, not in defending his Saviour's person with the material sword, which he had formerly used in cutting off the ear of Malchus, but in wielding the sword of the Spirit in the cause of righteousness. The sons of Zebedee were ambitious of glory. Ambition is in itself a magnanimous sentiment; therefore, Christ did not smother it in their breast, but He ennobled it by directing it to higher and holier ends. He taught them to aspire to a heavenly, instead of an earthly kingdom. Paul, after his conversion, retained the fiery zeal that had marked the youthful Pharisee, though it was now transformed into a zeal tempered by charity, and it found vent in evangelizing the world. Instead of dragging Christians before civil tribunals, as he was wont to do, we now find him arraigning Jews and Gentiles before the tribunal of conscience. Our Saviour did not blame Thomas for opening his mind and expressing his honest doubt upon the fact of the Resurrection ; but he gently reasoned with him, and removed that doubt by a palpable argu-

ment. In the same way, should the professor study, as far as possible, the individual character of his pupils, and adapt his instructions and admonitions to the capacity and temperament of each.

Regarding the discipline to be observed in our colleges and seminaries, the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore lays down the following judicious rules: "Let the discipline for regulating the whole course of life in the seminary be so arranged that it may savor neither of excessive rigor nor indulge pernicious laxity. The vigilance of superiors should be so tempered and moderated in maintaining it that it will not pry too closely into minute details, nor so hamper the minds of youth, as it were with chains, as to impede the normal expansion of their energies."

While the vigilance of superiors should be active in observing and prompt in correcting abuses, it should be entirely free from a spirit of espionage and distrust, which is calculated to make hypocrites, and to provoke the clandestine violation of rules. If the students are persuaded that they are habitually suspected and watched, they will also have their eye on their professors. They will take a morbid pleasure in eating the forbidden fruit, in drinking the "stolen waters, which are sweeter, and eating hidden bread, which is more pleasant." Like those that try to avoid the *Octroi* in French towns, they will come to regard their offences as purely penal without any moral sanction attached to them.

I once heard of a professor who always presupposed that the students were untrustworthy until they gave proof of virtue. The opposite rule, which assumes that they are good until their vicious character is made manifest, is, certainly, to be preferred. A gentleman once informed me that the principal of the academy in Europe in which he had made his studies, had an observatory, from which he could view all the boys in their respective rooms, and take note of any misdemeanor they might commit.

All right-minded men will agree that it is far better that youths should be religiously impressed with a sense of God's presence, that their enlightened conscience should be their monitor, and that the Faculty should appeal to their moral rectitude and honor rather than to their sense of fear.

This generous confidence in the student's honor is calculated

to develop a higher and nobler type of manhood, and to fit young men for the great world in which they will have no preceptors to admonish them, and in which their conscience will be their chief and often their only guide. And besides, wherever this method of government obtains, whatever chastisement may be inflicted on the transgressor in vindication of the law, will be sanctioned and applauded by the students themselves; for they feel that any grave violation of college discipline affects their personal honor and good name. I am happy to say that this system prevails in all the institutions of learning with which I am acquainted.

St. Augustine, in his *Confessions,* complains of the excessive harshness and severity of some teachers of his time. They multiply, he says, the labors and sorrows through which the sons of Adam are obliged to pass. Youth are better governed by motives of love and filial reverence than by servile fear, and their tasks are more diligently learned when enjoined by principles of duty than when enforced by threats of punishment; for "no one," he adds, "doth ever well what he doth against his will, even though what he doth be well."

The mode of punishment inflicted on refractory subjects has varied according to the popular sentiment prevailing at different times and in different countries. We are told in the *Life of Plutarch* that corporal chastisement was not tolerated in the school which he frequented in Greece. This authority was exercised only by parents. "The office of the teacher was to inform the mind. He had no power to extinguish the flame of freedom, or break down the noble independence of the soul by the degrading application of the rod." Plutarch informs us of a novel and ingenious method employed by his preceptor Ammonius in correcting his pupils. "Our master," he says, "having one day observed that we had indulged too freely at dinner, ordered his freedman, during his afternoon lecture, *to give his own son* the discipline of the whip in our presence. The philosopher all the while had his eye upon us, and we knew well for whom the example of punishment was intended." Our American youth would, I presume, submit with patient resignation to this vicarious sort of punishment, for it is easy to bear the misfortunes of others.

The experience of General Sheridan's schooldays was not so agreeable. His teacher had less scruple than Ammonius about

physical correction. He tells us in his *Personal Memoirs* that, when a youth, he attended a private school in Ohio. Whenever any one of the boys committed a serious breach of discipline, if the teacher was unable to detect the culprit, as was usually the case, "he would consistently apply the switch to the whole school without discrimination." It must be conceded that by this means he never failed to catch the real mischief-maker.

So great an authority as Dr. Johnson advocates moderate corporal punishment as an efficient means for curbing perverse and refractory spirits.

The ancient Lacedaemonian father was accustomed to inflict a second punishment on his son who complained of being chastised; for, he held, "he who would take the trouble to correct the son, showed thereby his affection for the father."

But the spirit of this country seems to be growing more and more averse to the application of the rod. I am persuaded that neither the authority of the sturdy Dr. Johnson nor the example of the Lacedaemonians will have any effect in supplanting the milder regime now in force in our educational institutions, especially in our Catholic colleges and seminaries; for while American fathers admit the wisdom of Solomon's maxim: "He that spareth the rod, hateth his son," they are reluctant to delegate to others their paternal prerogative.

It will be generally admitted, in conclusion, that he is a model disciplinarian who combines the paternal and maternal attributes in his relations to his pupils. While he is always expected to maintain the authority of a father, he should exhibit in a more marked degree, the affection and tenderness of a mother; for he who gains our heart easily commands the attention of our mind.

J. Card. Gibbons.

THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY.

BY JOHN GILMER SPEED.

Now, when gossip has become a recognized trade in which large capital is invested and many men engaged, it is most proper that we should consider and determine how far incursions may be made into the private life of the men and women of this country. A supreme court judge in the State of New York, in a recent noted case, decided that when a man became an artist, engaged in literature, or offered himself as a candidate for office, he parted with his right of privacy. I do not believe that this judge was more than partly right, and I do not believe that gossip as a trade has any greater rights because it has become a trade. Moreover, I believe that the definite establishment of this right of privacy is at this time of the greatest possible moment; for, without such a right and the easy enforcement of it, civilization must deteriorate, and modesty and refinement be crushed by brutality and vulgar indecency.

What is the right of privacy? Judge Cooley, in his admirable work on Torts, calls it the "right to be let alone." The ancients of our American institutions included it in that declaration which expressed the pledge of their lives and honors to defend the inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the *pursuit of happiness.*" As man comes into the world alone, goes out of it alone, and is alone accountable for his life, so may he be presumed to have by the law of his nature full right to live alone when, to what extent, and as long as he pleases. If he admit others to his society, if he share his thoughts with any, or work for the benefit of his fellow-man, he establishes no prescription against his privacy, and until the morality of his acts is duly and decently disputed, the modesty of good and common nature sets between him and the modern inquisition the protecting shield of

that knightly order whose motto has been aptly termed the eleventh commandment—"Mind your own business." That our laws do not afford complete and adequate protection of the right is neither argument against its validity nor objection that they should not be so adjusted as to accomplish that purpose.

Sir Henry Sumner Maine not long ago, in his Oxford lectures, called attention to the fact that law is a progressive science, and that new relations give rise to or develop new or inchoate rights, and a long line of cases in American and English courts gives proof that the application of remedies has from the very earliest time kept pace with the ever-shifting cunning of human aggression.

But has the right of privacy ever received recognition in the forum of administrative justice? We have rights of property, rights of life and bodily integrity. Do these enumerate all the personal rights? The laws of human community from long time recognized the inherent privilege of vindicating personal honor against slander and libel. The growth of this action, as such a proceeding is called in the law of English-speaking races, shows very clearly that by its very reason of existence that system provided for the possibility of modified relations and the invention of ingenious wrongs. Early in the application of common law the rigor of its rule was softened and the power of the remedy for wrong done with force and arms upon person and property was extended to injuries which were effected by trespass on the case. That was to say, if a man trespass, though he use not weapons in the doing of it nor apply physical force, yet shall the injured one have an equal right to damages, if any measure thereof can be found, with him whose person or property suffers actual wounding. By a similar reason the assault or attempt was made commensurate with the actual striking or battery, as a man would be damaged if he were obliged to put up his defence to ward off overtly threatened blows.

The doing of many acts to the injury of a person or of his property, which came not fully within the notion of violence, was included in the term "nuisance," and so had more or less effective remedy in judgment of damages. It was found that the healthy and common-sense rule that a man must so use his own as not to injure the goods or person of his neighbor was a very good one to follow in dealing out the rugged justice of our tribal

ancestors. Even the loss of services of wife, husband, or children became by a kind of uncouth courtesy a reason for the recovery of damages, which were often assessed at a figure expressly punitive of the wrong-doer in the killing, maiming, seducing, abducting, or grievously injuring of one or other of these relatives.

As the simple seagirt people of the western islands began to extend the scope of their operations beyond seas, it soon became certain that other rights existed, against the infringement of which their common law ought to protect them. Trade secrets and marks began to be regarded as property, and the fruits of invention came in a like manner to the care of the law. With the increase of books by aid of movable types came the idea of copyright. So many and complex became the relations which an extended commerce and tremendously increased activity soon laid upon the English people, that first they were constrained to aid the force of their traditional law by statutory additions and enlargement, and then to engraft upon their procedure some of the best methods of the Roman or Imperial codes. This was very satisfactorily arranged by setting up the Lord Chancellor as the keeper of the sovereign's conscience, and through him obtaining from that ever-flowing fountain of justice such helps as the wisdom of the civil law afforded.

The exclusive right to multiply copies of written or printed books has been one of the most edifying results of the long discussion, and is a declaration that a man has full right to the exclusive ownership of his written thought by common law. A familiar example of the enforcement of this view is the inviolability of property in correspondence. The contents of a letter may not be published without the consent of the writer. Another instance less familiar but not less forcible is the integrity of property in plays retained in manuscript, which is preserved notwithstanding their never so frequent presentation to the public.

The law of France, which follows the rule of the Roman Code, has explicitly declared the right of privacy, and provided measures for its vindication in the statutes relative to the control of the public press. The Penal Code of France has, since May, 1868, declared that any publication in newspaper or periodical of facts relating to one's private life shall be punished as a criminal offence.

It must readily be seen from these instances that the law, not only of our own but of other races, stands ready to assert enforceable privileges entirely apart from those which affect property and bodily safety. With the instantaneous photograph, the untamable reporter, and the Röentgen ray prying busily into the daily affairs of men, it becomes more than ever a serious problem whether man can be made secure from impertinent curiosity and mischievous or malicious spying.

Ever since the middle of the last century, when the courts of England declared that the writer of a private letter was entitled to prevent the receiver from publishing the contents thereof (Pope *vs.* Curl, 1741), the application to the right of privacy of the rules of law and equity has engaged the most serious attention of judges on both sides of the Atlantic. As early as 1820 the English courts, as is evidenced by the case of Youatt *vs.* Winyard, and other judgments, following the rule there declared, enjoined the publication of secrets obtained in the course of confidential employment, and they have, within a few months past, most emphatically reasserted the rule. In the case of Prince Albert *vs.* Strange, 1849, the defendant was prevented from selling or describing in print certain etchings made by Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort, and in that case the judge redeclared the governing principle which forms one of the chiefest beauties of our common-law system—that its rules are "providentially expansive and capable of adapting themselves to the various forms and modes of property which peace and cultivation might discover and introduce." The Lord Chancellor in the same case declared that the personal right invaded by the defendant was the right of privacy.

The right of heirs or children to protect the graves and monuments of their dead, asserted as long ago as the time of the learned Coke, and more recently exhaustively discussed in New York in the Beekman Street case (1854–1856), is established as sacred and inherent and independent of any considerations of property whatever. The exclusive use of one's own name was made the subject of recent decision in New York, when the late Sir Morell Mackenzie was allowed an injunction in 1891 against a certain Mineral Springs Company to prevent the use of his name and portrait, under the judicial declaration that their unauthorized use by the defendant was an injury to the physician.

Numerous cases have grown out of the unauthorized use of photography, and the right of privacy has been emphatically declared in cases where photographs have been either openly or surreptitiously obtained. In comparison to these cases there is afforded an excellent opportunity to note the difference between rights which are by nature inherent and those which arise from contract, actual or implied. In the English case of Pollard *vs.* Photographic Company, while the Court discussed at large the subject of the law of privacy, yet it appeared clearly that defendant's use of the plaintiff's portrait was a breach of an implied contract, for the photograph was made with the latter's consent and for private use. On the other hand, the recent American case of Manola *vs.* Stevens (1890) enjoined the use of a photograph of the plaintiff, an actress, taken without her consent by the use of the surreptitious flash light. This case, it is to be regretted, did not pass into the ranks of precedent, for the defendant submitted to the rule of the lower court. There would have been an excellent opportunity here to review the entire question of the right of privacy in its strictest construction, as the plaintiff was engaged in an occupation which devoted certain hours of her time to the portrayal of character before the public in drama. It would have been a nice point to distinguish between the voluntary relinquishment of so much of a person's right of privacy as must be laid aside by the actor when engaged in playing and the bestowal by that act of a general privilege to any and all to make and have pictures of the actor. It needs no citation from law or reason to establish the rule that the habit indulged in by so many actors of thrusting their portraits before the public, and filling the columns of daily newspapers with the most intimate as well as most trivial of their private affairs, does not take away from any member of the profession the right to be let alone when the curtain which hides his assumed character from the world is drawn close.

It is too bad, in fact, that in dealing with this vitally important subject of the enforcement of the right of privacy the ultimate courts have so often been, or seemed to be, obliged to decide the cases before them, in which this right was an important element, upon some point which left the larger subject unaffected by their judgment. It yet remains for some one to present a case in which a full and broad decision can be had. Two most

famous cases have been before the courts of late years in which all the essential matters affecting this important and inherent personal right were exhaustively studied and discussed by learned and eminent counsel and judges, and yet in each instance the court's decision was based upon some little fact which closed the door to authoritative precedent.

The well-known case of Schuyler *vs.* Curtis in New York engaged the attention of the courts and the public for a number of years, from 1891 until last December, when it was finally decided in the Court of Appeals at Albany. An effort had been made to secure a public subscription for the purpose of exhibiting a statue of Mrs. Mary M. Hamilton Schuyler, then deceased, at and during the World's Fair, Chicago, and afterwards in New York. The relatives of the deceased lady sought to prevent the act, and the means thereto, as invasions of the right of privacy. They represented the family of Mrs. Schuyler in the most direct heirship. The court in which suit was begun issued its order forbidding the proposed action. The preliminary order was twice continued upon reasons which Judge Morgan J. O'Brien at Chambers in the first, and Judges Van Brunt and Barrett at General Term in the second, instance held to have unequivocally established the right in the plaintiff to prevent intrusion upon the privacy of the memory of their kinswoman. Upon trial in November, 1892, that order was made permanent. In December, 1895, this judgment, the entire case having been exhaustively and carefully argued by able counsel upon both sides, was reversed by the Court of Appeals, in spite of an earnest, clear, and logical dissenting opinion by Judge John Clinton Gray, which he began with the words: "I most emphatically dissent from the decision of this court that there was no ground shown in this case for the equitable relief which was granted below. That a precisely analogous case may not have arisen heretofore, in which the peculiar power of a Court of Equity to grant relief by way of injunction has been exercised, furnishes no reason against the assumption of jurisdiction." The decision of the majority of the judges, delivered by Judge Peckham, proceeded upon the assumption as a principle that "whatever rights of privacy any individual may have died with him." Judge Peckham says: "Whatever right of privacy Mrs. Schuyler had died with her. . . . The right which survived, however extensive or limited,

was a right pertaining to the living only. . . . That right may, in some cases, be itself violated by improperly interfering with the character or memory of a deceased relative. . . . A privilege may be given the surviving relatives of a deceased person to protect his memory, but the privilege exists for the benefit of the living to protect their feelings and to prevent a violation of their own rights in the character and memory of the deceased." The opinion then goes on to review the matters of fact in order to reach a conclusion that the supposed injury to plaintiff's feelings was merely fanciful, and, though it does not alter the words, that it was one of those trifles for which the law cares not. In regard to this, Judge Gray says: "However opinions may differ with respect to the substantial nature of the injury to the feelings of Mrs. Schuyler's relatives, we have the finding" (the settlement of fact by the trial court) "that it was in fact caused, and we should not say that it was merely fanciful."

And so in this case the opportunity of giving us a light upon the obscurity of the right of privacy was avoided.

The English judges were called upon to act in this matter about the same time that the case above mentioned was pending. Their decision, though not referred to in Schuyler *vs.* Curtis, was rendered in 1894. A homicide was committed upon an estate called Ardlamont in Scotland, for which a young man named Monson was arrested and tried. The circumstances of the affair, the social standing of the victim and the accused, and the difficulty of obtaining any adequate reason for the strange and sudden death, caused a widespread sensation. The occurrence became and still is known as "The Ardlamont Mystery." The Scotch jury returned a verdict, "Not proven." This proceeding, not tolerated in English or American law, left the defendant neither condemned nor vindicated, and consequently but enhanced the morbid and insatiable curiosity of the public. The Tussaud Company, Limited, of London, successor of the celebrated Madame Tussaud, conducting an exhibition of waxworks, prepared and caused to be publicly displayed at their establishment in London a gruesome imaginary representation of the tragedy in what is termed a "Chamber of Horrors." In connection with this plastic solution of "The Ardlamont Mystery," they exhibited a waxwork figure of Mr. Monson, not in the awful group in the

"Chamber of Horrors," but in gentlemanlike and dignified semblance, in an adjoining passage, through which the public was obliged to walk before or after witnessing the invented portrayal of the crime with which Mr. Monson had been accused. Mr. Monson sought to prevent this exhibition as a breach of his right of privacy, by appeal to the equity power of the English bench. The notoriety of the original cause of the litigation, as may well be imagined, drew to this case the most widespread attention. Even from far-away India there came expression of the hope that this at last would give chance for the settlement of the question of the right of personal privacy. Some of the most capable jurists of the bar were engaged in the argument and presentation of the case, and all the elements of the important right involved were most carefully and learnedly elucidated. But here again expectation was doomed. Some one found an "if" lurking in an unconsidered corner, and dragged it out to destroy the rigor of that powerful helper of the law, the equity branch. One Louis Tussaud, who bore some relation to the defendants and conducted a similar business, claimed that Monson had given him permission to produce and exhibit the portraiture in question, and that a consideration for the privilege had passed between them. The existence of this claim was enough to stay the hand of equity. "If" there had been such a contract, to believe which the Court seems to have had reason, equity could not assist Mr. Monson to relieve himself from the consequences of his own act.

Perhaps the most signal recognition of the right of privacy is the spirit which underlies our positively declared and strictly enforced rule of law that no priest, lawyer, or physician can be compelled to testify as to matters confided to him in his professional capacity by another. This is called the rule of confidential communication, and is not limited to merely voluntary information, but covers all knowledge of a person or his affairs obtained in consequence of the professional relation. To the students of English law, it will not be difficult to refer the first implanting of this sturdy timber in the soil of our jurisprudence to the devious and cunning methods employed by the prosecutors at the trial of the Jesuit priests accused of complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, in the year 1606, to force or betray them into violation of their sacred duty towards the inviolability of the confessional. It was for avoidance of the questions pushed upon them for this

unworthy purpose that they were stigmatized as "equivocators," and the name of their society set down with ineffectual solemnity in dictionaries of the English tongue as a synonym for that dubiously polite label for one of the seven degrees of the lie. We have not been so very many years free from the odium of this uncharitable wresting of the law to wrong-doing. In spite of the fact that the rebellion of the colonies set up a new order of English law upon the hither shores of the Atlantic, for the perpetual fosterage of freedom, it was found necessary, even under the liberal provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States, to call the power of equity into the forum of conscience in order to protect a priest in his refusal to answer on the witness-stand about matters affecting his professional and confidential relations towards a person accused of crime. In this case the best minds of the New York bar were engaged in the task of establishing firmly and for all time the guaranty of this much of the sacred right of privacy. That assurance is now established beyond all cavil by the statute law of every state in the Union.

The celebrated English Chancellor Lord Eldon took occasion, while reviewing the case of Wyatt *vs.* Wilson (1820), to note as an analogy the supposed case: "If one of the late king's physicians had kept a diary of what he heard and saw, the Court" (of Equity) "would not, in the king's lifetime, have permitted him to print and publish it." While there is a hint in this reference to the unfortunate sovereign of the application of the rule forbidding the doing of things which are contrary to public policy, it is still true that in the case before the Chancellor the right of privacy was of such importance that he seems to have deemed it the foundation of the more familiar public safety. Why not? If the right of privacy exist, it belongs to all persons, artificial as well as natural. The state, in the workings of its diplomatic and police relations, in the regulation of its revenue, the councils of its lawmakers, and the deliberations of its juries, demands and is accorded the closest secrecy. Who dare intrude upon a meeting of cabinet ministers or publish their views without permission? Who ventures to betray the confidence of the secret service? Executive sessions of the legislative body are held with closed doors and should be remembered only with closed lips. The servants of justice, sworn to hear witnesses to disputed fact and weigh the value of their testimony, are not even themselves permitted to

disclose the privacy of the juryroom. Shame and contempt fall instantly upon the foolish violator of these public privacies—irrefutable proof that the reason lies in a law of humanity's nature. Nor does the same character of spontaneous proof fail in certain cases where private right to be let alone is grossly outraged. Only a little while ago the heart of the world trembled with detestation at the act of an English doctor—an act done in sheer and wanton outrage of the confidence of a patient. The grievance of this case was the betrayal to others by the defendant's physician of knowledge obtained by him in a professional relation towards the plaintiff, a married woman.

The illustrated journalism now prevalent finds its finest achievements in the publication of photographs surreptitiously taken. The value does not seem to lie in the fact that the photographs are of notabilities, but that they have been taken by stealth when the subjects were unconscious of the purpose of the person manipulating the camera. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that at least one of the newspapers of New York keeps a photographer busy in the streets of the metropolis taking "snap shots" at every person who appears to be of consequence. These are used at once, or filed away for use when occasion arises. Now, such practices are unquestionably invasions of the right of privacy; but we are told by the courts that the victims of such practices may not restrain by injunction the publication of photographs so taken, but that the remedy lies in a recovery for damages. This is no remedy at all, for the chances would be that some demagogue of a judge would declare that the hurt was but fanciful and too inappreciable for a merely earthly tribunal to estimate.

If, therefore, we cannot find, either among the cases which make up our rules of decision or upon the pages of the general laws, a positive declaration that all things which concern the private life, habits, acts, and relations of the citizen, and bear no necessary relation to his fitness for the public office toward which he is a candidate, or to his ability as a teacher, preacher, or professor in science or art, or any bearing upon acts done in any of these capacities, shall be subject to publication, in print or otherwise, only upon the consent of the person within whose right of privacy they lie, then the time has come when the legislatures must act so as to make the fundamental law as to these particular

rights of man operative and enforceable. Otherwise vulgarity will envelop the nation, and we will permanently deserve the reproach now put upon us by the nations of Europe—that in civilization we are on a par with the half-reclaimed Slavs of Russia, and only a trifle higher in the scale than the mongrels who live in perpetual revolution in Central and South America. The difficulty in the way is the fear that the liberty of the press may be restrained by any statute guarding the right of man's privacy. But the press never had any real right to invade proper privacy; so a law defining what privacy is and fixing a penalty for its invasion would not be any abridgment of the right of publication, for the right of improper publication never existed. Then again Americans as individuals must, if they think privacy worth preserving, abandon their disposition to suffer wrong rather than to take the trouble of being disagreeable. In other words, the individual citizen must cultivate to its highest development that confident moral courage which counts no sacrifice too great when made to enforce any atom of his rights.

JOHN GILMER SPEED.

CRIMINAL JURISPRUDENCE, ROMAN AND ANGLO-SAXON.

BY M. ROMERO, MEXICAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES.

I HAVE often heard, during my official residence in Washington, comparisons made between the Anglo-Saxon and Roman systems of criminal jurisprudence, generally very disparaging to the latter system, and this leads me to believe that our own, which is based on the Roman, is not quite well understood in this country. This, and not a desire to indulge in odious comparisons between the two systems, is my apology for writing a brief article intended to show that our system is not so defective as some believe. I think that in doing this I render a service to the good understanding between the United States and its Southern neighbors.

This subject has always had a great interest for me. Having been educated at home as a lawyer, I have desired to study and practically to compare the various systems of jurisprudence of different countries, believing this to be one of the best ways to understand the philosophy of that science. I regret, however, that the public duties which have devolved upon me during my whole life, and my long absence from home, depriving me of the opportunity of practising law in Mexico, have prevented my becoming better acquainted with all of its provisions and making a specialty of the study of jurisprudence. The same cause has prevented my studying fully the practical workings of the Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence, as existing in the United States. It is, therefore, with great reluctance that I approach such a difficult subject, believing, as I do, that I am not fully competent to treat it as thoroughly as I should like.

While I would not attempt to depreciate the Anglo-Saxon

system of jurisprudence, I think the Roman system is also entitled to some regard. The most remarkable of the Roman institutions, and the one which we might say survived the downfall of the Roman Empire, and the incursions of the barbarians with their feudal system, was the civil law; it contains all that was best of former ages and peoples. The advancement of old Etruria, the wisdom of Solon and Lycurgus, the principles of the legislation of Minos, and all that was of permanent value to Egypt, Phœnicia, Chaldea, and the foremost nations of the ancient times, were incorporated into the laws of the ten tables which were engraved 450 years before Christ; therefrom was developed the wonderful legal system which culminated in the institutes of Justinian in the year 534 of our era, a system which did more than anything else to assimilate to the Roman Republic the many dissimilar nations which became its provinces, and which were held together by the wonderful Roman civil law. The Roman law was really the result of freedom and free intellectual development, carried on during several centuries under the benign influence of Republican institutions. On the other hand, the common law was the natural result of the feudal or military system of the northern barbarians. The foundation, therefore, of the one is justice; the basis of the other is brute force.

It is generally considered that the corner-stone of the Anglo-Saxon criminal jurisprudence is the system of trial by jury; and yet it appears from recent researches that the jury system was not indigenous to the common law of England, but was borrowed from the Franks.* In fact, the original idea of the jury system appears to have been borrowed from the Roman law.

The advantages of this system have been much enlarged upon by different writers, both in England and America, as well as upon the continent of Europe. I do not care to criticise it, even though it seems to me, at least under existing conditions, to be open to grave objections. I will only remark that, when, eight hundred years ago, England was oppressed by a tyrannical king, the successful efforts of the English barons to wrest from him the Magna Charta, which gave to England no more than was already the common right of all the other nations of Central and Western Europe, enforced a concession which was nevertheless

* "*History of English Law before the Time of Edward I.*" By Sir Frederick Pollock and Frederick William Maitland, Cambridge, 1895, Vol. I., page 117.

justly regarded as an important step in securing human liberty. Even so, we know that the charter then granted was repeatedly violated by each and all the subsequent kings of England, down to the accession of the Stuarts. The Magna Charta was procured from King John by the barons mainly for themselves, but it inured to the benefit of the Commons, since it secured to them the right to be tried by their peers. Now, however, that the power of the Commons has so greatly overshadowed that of the barons that the two classes are rapidly merging into one, the changed conditions do not warrant any undue laudation of the great Charter. Certainly, in the United States, where all differences of class have disappeared since slavery was abolished, there is no reason to fear oppression of the people by those in authority, since the people themselves by their representatives are in power ; as a consequence, trial by jury of one's peers has no longer the significance which it may be supposed to have had under Magna Charta. The arbitrary power of arrest and detention residing in the sovereign, and against which it was the purpose of Magna Charta to guard, has never existed in the United States, where the power of the President to order the arrest of a civilian exists only when the writ of *habeas corpus* is suspended in cases of rebellion, invasion, and other great public danger, and in extradition cases as provided in the respective treaties.

While I should not like to express any decided convictions on this subject, I may safely say that the conditions under which the jury system was established or adopted do not prevail at the present time, even in the country of its supposed origin ; it cannot, therefore, have the importance it once had. The insufficiency of this system to punish criminals is made evident, I think, by its practical results which have unfortunately brought about what is commonly called Lynch Law, and by the fact that these in their turn have given rise to a practice which is based upon a defect in existing law, and which therefore comes to be in fact the complement of criminal proceedings under the Anglo-Saxon system. It is hardly necessary to add that lynch law is highly demoralizing, that it is open to great abuses, and that when the victim is an innocent person it amounts to a grave crime. When a community is satisfied that a crime has been committed, that a particular person is the author of that crime,

and that he cannot be punished under the regular proceedings of a common-law trial, they often take the law into their own hands and they administer swift justice in a manner that is often barbarous, but in the only way left to them. In any case the demoralizing effects of lynch law are so great, and I might say so shocking, that any system which seems to make such law necessary as a consequence of its own defects, ought to be revised so as to put an end to that terrible practice. Perhaps lynching is not only due to the imperfections of the jury system, but also to the system of procedure, that causes delays in bringing about a trial, and often to the chicane and deficient preparation of the prosecuting officer.

The jury system as applied to criminal cases is undoubtedly more favorable to the accused than to society. That it has faults is evident from the fact that some of the States of this Union, like Maryland, for instance, have enacted statutes allowing the accused to select whether he shall be tried by jury or by a judge, and this notwithstanding the constitutional provision on the subject. I regard that provision as the first step to undermine the jury system.*

But the force of example, and the great credit which Anglo-Saxon institutions have attained in the world on account of their respect for individual rights, have induced some of the American nations of Latin origin to adopt the jury system, and we have done so in Mexico. Señor Mariscal, our present Secretary of State, who lived in the United States from 1863 to 1877, as Secretary of the Legation up to 1867, and afterwards as Minister from Mexico in Washington—and who is an eminent jurist, a thorough student, and a careful observer—made a special study of the jury system in the United States, and when he went home and became Secretary of Justice under President Juarez's administration, he established, in 1869, the jury system in the Federal District of Mexico for criminal cases, changing it somewhat so as to adapt it to the peculiar conditions of the Mexican character. He provided, for instance, that a majority of the eleven jurors

* A report of the Committee of the Judiciary of the House of Representatives (No. 108, Fifty-fourth Congress, First Session), presented by Mr. Updegraff, of Iowa, on January 22, 1896, which contains several tables compiled by the Department of Justice of homicides perpetrated in the United States of which cognizance has been taken by the Federal Judicial authorities, and states the number of indictments, convictions, and acquittals, shows (Table No. 2) that in the year 1892, of 29 Judicial Federal Districts the Federal Judicial authorities took cognizance of 112 homicides, out of which came 96 indictments, 24 of the accused being convicted and 37 acquitted, only one execution having taken place.

composing our jury should render a verdict, while under the Anglo-Saxon system the unanimous vote of the twelve jurors is required. It was provided, besides, with a view to prevent the failure of justice, that if, in the opinion of the presiding judge, the verdict were clearly against the evidence, he should so report to the higher court, with a motion to set that verdict aside, and, if the higher court should sustain his opinion, a new trial should be granted, unless eight jurors had concurred in the verdict, in which case it should be final and could not be set aside. These provisions were somewhat changed by an Act issued on the 24th of June, 1891, which provides that the jury shall be composed of nine jurors, that a majority of them shall render a verdict, and that the decision of the jury shall be final if given by seven votes. Even with all these alterations in the system, I have seen cases in Mexico where criminals have gone unpunished, because through the eloquence of their attorneys the jury has been influenced in their favor.

Under the system of criminal jurisprudence prevailing in the Federal District of Mexico, all the preliminary proceedings in a criminal trial, such as the examination of the accused, the taking of testimony, etc., take place before the judge who presides over such proceedings without a jury ; when this has been completed and the case is ready to be submitted, the jury is empaneled and the evidence is read to it as set forth in the record already formed ; the prosecuting attorney then presents the charges, the defense is heard and the witnesses of both parties are examined and cross-examined ; thereupon the jury renders its verdict, adjudging the accused either innocent or guilty, following substantially the practice under the common law of England and of the United States. In most of the Mexican States prevails the old Spanish system of criminal jurisprudence.

I often hear it asserted in this country that the proceedings under the Roman law are secret, and that the accused does not know what the witnesses have testified against him. This assertion is entirely incorrect, and often leads to very grave misunderstandings. One of the difficulties that the Spanish-American countries have to contend with at Washingtan, in cases where citizens of the United States are tried by the local judges in any of those countries, is the great difference between their criminal

legislation and procedure and the system prevailing in this country.

According to the Roman system, every criminal trial is divided into two stages. During the summary (*sumario*), which is the first, and the purpose of which is to ascertain the facts connected with the case, the testimony of the accused is taken down, sometimes without his knowing who may be the witnesses testifying against him, or the crime with which he is charged. During the plenary (*plenario*), or second stage, all the proceedings of the summary are made known; and thereafter all the proceedings are public, the accused enjoying the same rights which are guaranteed to him by the common law. To this latter statement there may be some slight exceptions, as, for instance, the fact that bail is allowed in only a few specified cases, determined by law, and never when the person may, upon conviction, be liable to bodily punishment. It would, however, take more space than is allowed in an article of this character, to state the respective advantages of the two systems, and I shall, therefore, limit myself to briefly mentioning the principal differences between them.

The secret proceedings of the *sumario* are much criticised in the United States, it being forgotten that the English common law likewise provides a secret proceeding very similar to the *sumario*. Before anyone is indicted in this country, the case is heard secretly by a grand jury, a body composed of persons who, in some cases at least, are secretly designated. The grand jury listens to such testimony as is offered, or as it may deem sufficient, without permitting the accused to be present or to know what transpires; and if in their judgment there should be sufficient ground, an indictment is found; and thereafter the public trial begins before the court. It is very difficult, of course, to make any general statement which will be accurately true with respect to all of the forty-five commonwealths which compose this country, since, as is well known, each of them has its own legislation.

In some states, as in New York, a preliminary hearing may take place before a police magistrate, who has in some petty cases power to inflict punishment, release the accused, or hold him for the action of the grand jury. Sometimes, however, no arrest is made until an indictment has been found by the

grand jury, or in cases of misdemeanor for trial by a court of judges if the defendant waives a jury.

So far, therefore, as a proceeding under one system may be said to correspond to a proceeding under the other, it may be said that the *sumario,* in countries where the Roman law prevails, corresponds practically to a grand jury indictment in Anglo-Saxon nations.

In the Latin countries testimony is taken down in writing, and, after being read to the witness, is signed by him in proof of the fact that his statements have been correctly recorded. It gives a degree of certainty to the correctness of the testimony which cannot be obtained by a stenographic report; and it renders it impossible for the judge or opposing counsel to put into the mouth of a witness language different from that which he has actually used. When the summary is ended, all the testimony is presented to the accused for his examination; and the right is then given him to cross-examine the witnesses who have appeared against him. The cross-examination is an old Spanish proceeding which we call "*careo,*" and which in Spanish means that the accused is personally confronted with the witnesses in the presence of the judge, for the purpose of cross-examining them. It is therefore quite incorrect to assert that, because the *sumario,* or first stage of the trial under the Latin system, is kept secret, therefore the accused does not know anything regarding the evidence presented against him; the fact being that during the second or plenary stage of the proceeding he is fully informed of all that has been done, and is given ample opportunity to refute it, either by presenting his own witnesses or by cross-examining such as have been presented by the other side, or called by the judge.

Another right guaranteed to the accused under the Mexican law, and which in its broadest sense is unknown to the common law as such, is the right of appeal: that is to say, the right in every case to have both the law and the facts reviewed by a higher court. Under the Mexican laws this right is very broad. Our laws provide that no decision made by judge or jury condemning the accused can be executed until after it has been affirmed by a higher court. Not only is the accused given the right to appeal once, and sometimes twice, from any decision against him, but it is also made the duty of the lower court to

send the case with the record for review to the higher court in cases where the convicted person does not himself appeal. Such is the practice under the Roman and Spanish law; but in the Federal District of Mexico, where the jury system has been adopted, the case goes to the higher court only on appeal of the aggrieved party, and said appeal only affects questions of law and not the facts as stated before the jury, which cannot be controverted.

It is true that under the common law system of criminal jurisprudence the accused or his lawyer can take exceptions to points decided by the judge during the trial, and that these exceptions may be reviewed by a higher court, but this can hardly be said to be an appeal, in the sense contemplated by the Mexican law, because the decision of the appellate court is only limited to those points which may be covered by the exceptions taken at the trial. It is true that in some States, as, for instance, in New York, an appeal can now be taken which will bring before the court for review questions of fact as well as questions of law; but in so far as this procedure has been adopted, it is a departure from the strict rules of the common law and an adoption of the principles of the Roman law, since, according to the theory of the common law, a jury can make no mistake, and its findings of fact are therefore final.

Our Constitution of 1857 is so careful not to allow anybody to be kept in prison for any extraordinary length of time that Article 19 specially provides that as soon as a man shall have been arrested the judge shall immediately hold a preliminary examination, and shall within three days from the time of the arrest render his decision. If the judge shall be of opinion that there is sufficient ground for continuing the investigation the prisoner shall be remanded; otherwise he shall be set at liberty. In the first instance the judge has to sign what is called in Spanish *auto de prision formal,* meaning an order of formal commitment. In the second place, the prisoner is set at liberty. This proceeding corresponds in a measure to the grand jury investigation under the common law. As I have already stated, in some States, like New York, a committing magistrate is authorized to examine the case as a preliminary step to the investigation of the grand jury. Where such a practice prevails two examinations take place before the criminal charge upon which the accused is to be

finally tried is definitely formulated, while under our system only one investigation is made and even that must be completed within three days of the arrest.

The assertion, often heard, that American citizens tried in Mexico are not notified of the cause of their arrest; that they are not confronted with their accusers; and that they are not allowed to appear in self-defense, is in open contradiction to the express provisions of our statutes. As a matter of fact, Article 20 of our Constitution of 1857, grants the following guarantees to the accused in criminal cases:

1. That the cause of the proceeding and the name of the accuser be made known to the accused.

2. The preliminary examination of the accused must be held within forty-eight hours from the time he is placed at the disposal of the judge.

3. He may cross-examine the witnesses who testify against him.

4. Such information as the accused may need for the purpose of answering the indictment must be given him, if it be in the record.

5. He must be heard in his own defence either in person or by some attorney of his own selection, or by both, as he may elect; and in case he should have no one to appear for him he is furnished with a list of lawyers appointed for such cases, and is given the right to select as his attorney any one whom he may think proper.

We have copied in our constitution from the Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence the writ of *habeas corpus,* the great conquest of the Anglo-Saxons, which guarantees life and liberty to man, and which places under the control of the judiciary the otherwise arbitrary orders of those in authority; but we have gone considerably farther in this direction, and under the name of *amparo* have extended this guarantee so that it is not limited to the protection of personal life and liberty, but embraces all rights under the Constitution—including the right of personal property, even when such rights have been defined by judicial decisions. If, for instance, a man finds that his property, or any other of his constitutional rights, are interfered with, either by civil or military authority, or even by a judicial sentence of a federal or state court, he may apply to the respective federal district court having jurisdiction thereof to at once suspend the act complained

of, and finally to decide the case, either in his favor or against him, the decision always coming for revision to our Supreme Court.

Some American citizens who are tried in Spanish-American countries expect that the proceedings there will be conducted in accordance with the legislation of their own country, and, when they find it otherwise, they complain bitterly, considering the Latin proceedings as inquisitorial, outrageous, and even barbarous; and complaining that they are not tried under the laws in force in this country, as if the legislation of the United States should extend to foreign countries. My experience has shown me that this is sometimes the cause of serious difficulties and misunderstandings between the United States and some of the Spanish-American republics.*

I often hear the complaint, too, that under the Roman system the trial proceeds slowly, and it is asserted that criminal trials in the United States terminate more speedily. I am not prepared to say under which of the two systems of criminal procedure the trial is sooner brought to an end. When the trial actually begins it may take a shorter time in the United States, because, once begun, it cannot be interrupted. It often happens, however, that a long time elapses before a case is brought to trial; and this time is longer when a new trial is granted. It should be borne in mind that most of the courts in this country hold sessions but for a few weeks or months at a time, and that only during these

* As an instance of the kind of charges made against Mexico through the press by irresponsible parties, I will mention a case which recently occurred. A telegram dated at Omaha, Neb., on November 23, 1895, and published broadcast by the papers of this country, stated that Col. W. A. Paxton, of that city, had received a letter from Mac Stewart, an old employee of his, who was under sentence of death at Parral, Chihuahua, Mexico, for shooting a policeman who was trying to kill him for a trivial offence, and stated that Stewart desired to be placed in a court where he would be allowed to plead self-defence, which he pretended was not permitted under the Mexican laws. What has already been said about the Mexican criminal jurisprudence is enough to show how entirely unfounded such a statement was.

Whenever I notice any complaint of this character in the newspapers, it is my custom to communicate the same to the Mexican Government and to request an official investigation of the case, so that I may rectify the statement, if it should prove to be incorrect, or remedy the wrong before it assumes a serious aspect, if in fact there should be any real cause for complaint. In due course I generally receive an official statement which is almost always at great variance with the complaint. In this particular case, the facts in it turned out to be that Mac Stewart abused a policeman who was unarmed, and, following him to the post-office, at Parral, fired upon him without the slightest cause, killing him instantly; that, not satisfied with this, he killed the policeman's horse, and then fired upon the Chief of Police who arrested him. It further appeared that this was his second offence of this character, as he had killed before in Mexico a man named Rogers, a United States citizen. In the case of Rogers, Mac Stewart was acquitted, and upon the trial for the murder of the policeman he was allowed to plead self-defence, but failed utterly to establish it, as all the witnesses examined, including an American citizen by the name of Davis, a friend of Mac Stewart, testified that there had been no provocation on the part of the policeman, and that the accused had committed a wilful and wanton murder.—M. R.

sessions do they hear cases. In Latin-American countries, on the other hand, the courts are open and working all the year round. Morover, under the common law system the whole of the trial takes place before the jury, so that the exclusive attention of the court is necessarily devoted to that case. Only one case, therefore, can be tried at a time. In Latin-American countries a judge may try several cases concurrently, because, even where the jury system has been adopted, as it has in Mexico, a great portion of the proceedings takes place before the judge without the jury. As a consequence of this, trials in this country, by reason of the crowded condition of the dockets, are often delayed for months at a time, while in the Latin countries trials begin as soon as the prisoners are arrested.

I often hear in this country great complaints made against the Mexican prisons, which are said to be uncomfortable and sometimes considered almost filthy. It is a fact that some prisons in Mexico are in a very poor condition; that, however, is a result of the limited resources of the country. A poor country cannot afford to build magnificent prisons, yet notwithstanding that we have to contend with want of means, we are building fine penitentiaries in the City of Mexico and in the capitals of some of our States; prisons which may be advantageously compared with any to be found in this country.

Prisons cannot be as comfortable as palaces or hotels; and even in this country, with all its wealth, advancement and prosperity, prisons are sometimes very objectionable. If we had two sets of prisons in Mexico—one for Mexican citizens and the other for foreigners—and if the former were more comfortable than the latter, the citizens of this country would have reason to complain, but if we treat them on an equal footing with our own citizens, and if we give them the best we can—that is, if we keep them in the same building, provide the same food and extend to them the same conditions that we do to our own citizens—I fail to see how there can be any cause for complaint.

It should not be difficult to see which system of criminal jurisprudence is, on the whole, best calculated to do justice by ascertaining the real facts of the case, whether by a judge of long experience and proficiency in his profession, with no personal interest in the cases tried before him, or by a jury composed of men who have no experience in criminal jurisprudence. If the judge may

sometimes be derelict in his duties, so also may the jury occasionally be controlled by their emotions. If the judge fail to do his duty, his failure will be corrected by an appellate court, as all cases must be reviewed upon appeal. For the improper verdict of a jury there is often no adequate remedy. The Anglo-Saxon criminal jurisprudence is founded upon the principle that it is better to let one hundred criminals go unpunished rather than to inflict that punishment upon a single innocent person. The Latin system, while it accepts that humanitarian principle, is nevertheless better calculated to prevent the escape of a criminal unpunished.

There is a provision in our Constitution which is often misunderstood and which has given rise to the idea that we sometimes administer justice in too speedy a manner and with a complete disregard of the forms of law established for the protection of human life. Our Constitution commences with a declaration of the rights of man, taken in a great measure from the declaration of the French National Assembly during the Revolution, which in its turn was, in a great measure, taken from the Declaration of Independence of the United States. These rights secure the most ample liberty and immunity both to the person and property of the inhabitants of the country. While our Constitution was being formed, however, it was contended that on extraordinary occasions, as in case of war, or other serious danger to society, the rights guaranteed by the Constitution might stand very much in the way of inflicting needed and speedy punishment. To obviate this, the Constitution itself, in Article XXIX., provides that the rights of man, as guaranteed by that instrument, excepting such as secure his life, may be suspended for a short time, in certain emergencies, provided that suspension be upon the President's initiative and with the consent of Congress; and provided further that the suspension shall be applicable to a class; that it shall not apply to an individual; and that it shall be for a brief period. If it should be found for instance that the crime of derailing railway cars, either for the purpose of robbing them or for any other unlawful end, should become frequent, and if it should be found that the emergency called for extraordinary measures, the President would ask Congress for the suspension of the personal guarantees of this class of criminals for a limited period, say six

months; and if Congress should sanction this suspension, a summary criminal proceeding would be established, for the purpose of inflicting punishment without delay, thereby deterring others who might be disposed to commit the same crime. At the end of the period fixed, public confidence would have been restored, and there being no further need for the unusual measures adopted, the suspension of constitutional guarantees would come to an end. It will be seen that our constitution provides a speedy way for punishing criminals in extraordinary cases, without the unfortunate need which the condition of things has sometimes made necessary in this country—especially in California in former years—of establishing a committee of public safety to preserve order, a proceeding which meant that the people took the law into their own hands, acting without regard to the usual legal forms and oftentimes in a manner closely resembling Lynch Law.

When we pass from criminal to civil jurisprudence, the superiority of the Roman law is incontrovertible, and a few remarks on that subject will be pertinent in this case.*

One of the most conclusive proofs that the Roman law is not inferior to the English common law is that England, the very country where it had its birth, was obliged to establish two systems of civil jurisprudence, one the Common Law proper, which was administered through the older and ordinary courts, and the

*In an admirable address that Judge Martin F. Morris, Associate Justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and Professor of Constitutional and International Law, Admiralty, and Comparative Jurisprudence, in the Law School of Georgetown University, District of Columbia, delivered before the graduating class in 1891, he said, referring to the subject of the common law and the Roman law (pages 30 and 31) the following:

. . . "But, however it be in criminal cases, I have no hesitation whatever, after a long experience of it, to assert that, as a mode of determination of civil causes and private controversies, the genius of man has never yet devised anything more absurd than the organized ignorance and besotted prejudices of twelve men in a jury box. The man who has a good case is always desirous to have it taken away from the determination of a jury and to submit it, to the arbitrament of a court alone—to the arbitrament, in fact, of any one other than the twelve men in the jury box; while the dishonest litigant, the unprincipled lawyer, and the speculating knave, are ever loud in their demands for trial by jury; for only upon the prejudices, the passions, the ignorance, or the corruption of juries can they base their hopes of success. This is the experience of every man who has had to do with courts of law, and it speaks volumes to the discredit of the system. Then the divided responsibility of court and jury, the necessity of immediate decision by the former of questions of law upon which appellate tribunals often deliberate for weeks and months without coming to a satisfactory conclusion, the consequent necessity of repeated trials before a final decision is reached—all contribute to render the system exceedingly unsatisfactory in its methods, no less than its results.

. . . We think we are fully justified in the assertion that there is no one feature of our jurisprudence that tends more in practice to a denial of justice than the system of trial by jury. It may, perhaps, have done well enough in a barbarous age, when judges may not have been more intelligent than juries, and may have been, in fact, the tools and minions of despotic power; but in this age and country it is nothing more than a relic of feudal barbarism."

other the Roman Law, administered through the chancery or equity courts. Law is supposed to be the perfection of justice and the best expression of human reason; it should then embrace not only equity, but the very essence of justice itself. If, therefore, a particular law or system of law fails to include equity, that law or system cannot be perfection. The very idea that equity can be a thing outside and different from law seems contradictory and absurd.

Although the chancery or equity courts were in the beginning established in England only for the purpose of trying such cases as could not be reached by the common law, or in which the processes of the common law courts afforded no adequate remedy, the Roman law came finally to be in reality the law which was intended to fill the gaps and remedy the defects of the common law. The common law courts were always very jealous of the equity courts; but after the decision of King James I., in the controversy between Sir Edward Coke, on the one side, representing the common law courts, and Lord Ellesmere, the Lord Chancellor, and Lord Bacon, on the other, representing the equity, or Roman law courts—it was established that a man might have recourse to a court of equity in many cases after his rights had been adjudicated at the common law courts. The establishment of this principle was equivalent in fact, though not in form, to giving an appeal from the courts of common law to the courts of equity, thus recognizing the superiority of the Roman over the common law system. It is true that the equity courts could not reverse the decision of the common law courts, but if in the trial of the same case an equity court reached an opposite or different conclusion, the judgment of the common law court could not be executed, and became, therefore, in fact nullified.

I am well aware that a common law lawyer will not admit that the equity courts can reverse the judgment of the common law courts, because legally and technically that cannot be done; but as a matter of fact such is the practical consequence of the system as it now exists. If a common law court, for instance, decides a case against the defendant, and if after that decision the defendant finds proofs to establish his contentions, he may still go to the equity court, present his proofs and ask that the plaintiff be enjoined from executing the judgment against

him ; and in such cases the equity court has jurisdiction to grant such an application. In a case like the one cited the equity court does not pretend technically to revise or reverse the judgment of the common law court ; but by granting the injunction against its execution it practically effects its reversal ; and such a system therefore actually produces the same result as though the equity court were a court of appeals.

The American people, with their practical common sense, have remedied a great many of the defects of the common law practice in civil cases, changing it gradually to such an extent that now it can hardly be said that the English common law system, as expounded by Blackstone, is in force in the United States. It is still called the common law, but for all practical purposes it is almost superseded by the Roman law.

Even as regards the jury system, and notwithstanding the fact that this has been considered the corner-stone of common law criminal jurisprudence, some States of this country have, as I understand, changed the foundation of that system by not requiring a unanimous verdict for the conviction of the accused.

The very country which established, and for years maintained, the common law has practically superseded it by the Roman jurisprudence. In one of the acts of the British Parliament passed in the years of 1873, 1874 and 1875 the whole system of English Courts of Justice was remodelled after the systems prevailing in countries which had adopted the Roman law, and it was provided that when the rules of common law and those of equity come into conflict, the latter shall prevail. Such a provision is almost equivalent to repealing the common law itself.

The literal application of the common law, is I think, another of its disadvantages. A Common Law judge is bound to apply the law in its literal meaning, even in case that may involve a denial of justice, while a Roman law judge applies the letter of the law to the case where it fits exactly, and has some discretion to be guided by the meaning and object of its statute, rather than by its literal words when its words conflict with justice or equity.

American lawyers, in arguing cases, and judges in deciding them according to the practice under the common law system, are controlled almost entirely by precedents, and while considerations of justice and equity are sometimes indulged in,

they have legally but little weight. Such a system is very unsatisfactory, because, each case being different from every other, the decisions in the one cannot be made to exactly fit the other. Moreover, it entails a herculean task upon the lawyers and judges, making it obligatory for them to search for precedents not only in the courts of their own country, but even in those of England. With the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, this work is still more arduous, since they must examine and be familiar with not only all cases decided by the various Federal courts, but by all the courts of the forty-five different commonwealths which form this Union, each with its own distinct legislation, and with the Roman law also, as the State of Louisiana has adopted it, entailing besides the need of keeping a very large library. Doubtless, no public functionaries under the Federal Government have more arduous work imposed upon them. The day is not long enough to permit its completion, and I have personally known more than one who have broken down under that tremendous strain.

This condition of things shows that the common law is still in its rude and primary state, viz., still setting precedents. After sufficient precedents have been collected to form a code, they should be codified if the United States shall not previously have accepted in its entirety the Roman law. The Roman law had to pass through these different stages, and it passed them all, until it assumed the shape in which it is at present. It has been fully digested, and its principles formulated into simple rules, while the common law is yet in process of development, still passing through the primary stages.

I hope that these few observations, which have been written without preparation, will assist in dispelling the misapprehension which exists in this country regarding the criminal jurisprudence of Spanish-American nations, and in that way contribute to the better understanding between the United States and her sister Republics. A careful study of the Roman system of jurisprudence by Anglo-Saxon judges, lawyers, and statesmen has resulted in the adoption of many features of the Roman law, and a careful and comparative study of both systems would very likely lead to a conclusion in favor of an eclectic one, which would combine the best features of both.

M. Romero.

WHY WOMEN SHOULD HAVE THE BALLOT.

BY THE LATE GENERAL JOHN GIBBON, U. S. A.

I HAVE been seeking for some years a good, sound reason why women should not vote, and I have, after diligent search, found *one*, and only one. It is because they are women. There is no other, so far as I have yet been able to discover, which rises above the frivolous. Various so-called reasons have been urged, indeed: women, it is said, are weak, foolish, frivolous, dependent; they can't fight; they have other and more important duties to attend to; they have all the rights they ought to have now; they are protected by men's votes, and so forth, but the real and only reason is that they are women. There are men, and plenty of them, against whom all the considerations enumerated above, except that of sex, can be urged as reasons why they should not vote; but they are never urged against *them* because they are *men:* that is, they belong to that class which heretofore has had the *power* to say who shall vote.

Women have life, property, opportunities for pursuit of happiness, to protect just as men have. Why should they not have the same means of guarding these that men have? The only reason is that they had the bad luck to come into the world as females, and man got "the drop" on power first.

Protection by proxy will not hold for a moment. In this country no man is willing to admit that his rights can be protected by the vote of another. No such doctrine as that has ever been admitted here, and men would laugh it to scorn even when the man whose right to be protected was a black man just emerging from an ignorant, degraded servitude. So well was the absurdity of such a theory recognized that, for their protection, the right to vote was placed after the war in the hands of persons, many of whom were but little above the brutes, provided always

they were fortunate enough to have come into the world *males*.

Man, in the aggregate, says in his might that certain classes of persons shall not vote, and specifies non-citizens, paupers, convicts, idiots, and women; and these classes are excepted for the good of society—all except the women. An idiot, even, might see why a pauper and a convict should not vote, and if he is an honest idiot he might have a glimmering as to why he himself should not; but it would puzzle him to tell why a woman should be put in the same class with himself, the pauper, and the convict.

Suffrage, it is said, is not a *right*. Perhaps it is not; but, then, neither is life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness—*in some places*. In this country, however, it was solemnly declared over a century ago that these are amongst the inalienable rights of mankind, bestowed upon them *equally* by the Creator, and that, to secure them, governments are instituted among men, deriving their *just* powers from the consent of the governed. No such right had ever been more than dreamed of before that, and we have been ever since striving to make good the assertions of our forefathers. We have succeeded, too, pretty well, considering the difficulties in our path, one of which was a four-years' slaughter of our brothers to force them to acknowledge the truth of the words of our ancestors.

There are some things not yet made exactly straight, and in striving to point out what they are, we are met at the very threshold by two pertinent enquiries: (1) Is woman a "person"? and (2) Is she governed with her "consent"? It is scarcely worth while to offer any argument on the first question, as probably almost all will acknowledge that she *is* "a person." So far as the second is concerned all must accept it as true that she is governed with her consent, just as the other members of the class in which she is placed by man are governed with their consent, namely, the non-citizen, the pauper, the convict, and the idiot.

An eminent divine recently declared that the old maxim that there should be no taxation without representation is utterly inapplicable to this question of woman suffrage; but he failed to give any reason, good or bad, for his assertion, although he attempted to offer some excuses for it.

Women who are taxed, he urged, are represented by their

relatives, potent influence, by men's sense of justice, chivalry, etc. All of which amounts to this: the paupers, the convicts, the idiots, and the aliens are represented in the same way, leaving out the "chivalry," which is a very poor representative with a great many people.

All we have to do to set aside this argument of "representation by proxy" is to recall the very many women who have no "relatives," "influence," "sense of justice," or "chivalry" to represent them. They have to go without even this poor representation, and thus inequality and injustice are perpetuated. It is gratifying to know that "women's property" is better protected than men's in *one* State; but is it true that this protection is better in *all* States, or as good? As long as this is not so, just so long are inequality and injustice maintained in violation of our fundamental law.

A woman being "a person" is *a citizen* of the United States (if born or naturalized in them), by virtue of the amendments which abolished human slavery in this country; and by the same amendments every "citizen" is entitled to all privileges and immunities under the law and to its equal protection.

If women have progressed towards an approach to the *equal* protection of the laws, it has been due more to the progress of human affairs in this century than to any thing else; and it is possible that much of this progress has been due to the influence of women in rectifying a state of affairs which would not originally have existed if women had been represented by their own votes, instead of being represented by man's "chivalry," etc. Representative "chivalry" may do very well for those fortunate enough to possess it, but if *all* could appeal to it with confidence and security there would no longer be any need for whipping-posts as a punishment for wife beating. This progress in public sentiment has wiped from the statute books of some of the States laws which were a disgrace to the age; and which would never have been there could women have applied in time an ounce of prevention.

Having demonstrated, as I think, the woman's clear right constitutionally to the ballot, it may be well to note some of the evils which, in man's imagination, are going to follow the granting of this right.

To my mind one of the funniest of these apprehensions is the

possibility of man's being "jostled," or woman's being insulted, at the polls. Are men jostled at the church door, at the theatre entrance, or at the ticket office? Or are women insulted there? Is there any more chance of jostling or insulting at the polls than at any of these places? On the contrary, are not the chances less at the polls than anywhere else? I refer now, of course, to *this country* alone. How long would it take an American public to discover that a woman with temerity enough to "jostle" a man, or a man foolish enough to insult a woman there, was grossly outraging the highest prerogative of American citizenship?

All sympathy bestowed upon women who may be told they must vote, and all talk about how very difficult it would be in this case "to make the horse drink," are entirely wasted. We do not tell even men in this country: "You must vote." It is made their privilege to exercise the right of franchise. All true Americans then look upon this right as a *duty* which they perform with greater or less conscientiousness. Nearly all others are drawn to the polls by the wiles of the politician who needs the votes, or by the wealth of the rich who crave office and influence. It needs no very close study of human nature to predict which, under such circumstances, will perform most faithfully the patriotic duty, the woman or the man. If the woman does not come out ahead in that race, she will fall short of the just expectations of mankind, and belie her past history. The trouble with her now is that she does not clearly see what her duty demands. She occupies the position of a child who does not want to take medicine which will do her good, because it looks bad or tastes bad, and man is doing everything in his power to confirm her in the notion that her instincts and prejudices are well founded. She does not know what a power for good this ballot is. She has been so well taken care of in this country that she cannot imagine herself any better off, and is perfectly willing to think that this state of things will last forever, and that no retrogression is possible. If you invite attention to the fact of the large number of ignorant votes which go towards creating the law-making power under which she lives, her only thought apparently is the dread of coming in contact with the dirty, ignorant casters of those votes when she may be called upon to go to the polls; and in this thought she is industriously encouraged by political man,

who does not desire to increase a class of votes which he may not be able to influence, and knows he cannot buy.

What the result would be is not quite so much a matter of conjecture as the Bishop of Albany appears to think, for the problem of woman suffrage has already been partially solved, and the solution is growing in strength day by day, as the conviction becomes forced on the community where the experiment is in process of trial, that the ballot in the hands of woman, so far from being an evil, is a positive blessing. The fear, in those communities, that a few thousand votes deposited by fallen women can hold the balance of power in an election against the many, many more thousands of women who are alive to the full importance of the franchise privilege, is no longer felt. Such fears need no longer excite the apprehensions of theorists carried away by the "enormous and awful probability of a vote that *might* turn the tide of an election, purchasable by the highest bidder." Let those who entertain such apprehensions rest easy. The man who should win his election by the purchase of such a vote would be speedily relegated to the walks of private life by the votes of women whose duty it would then be doubly strong to cast them. It is rather dangerous and illogical to draw a conclusion "through an imaginary premise," and that is exactly the pit I fear the Bishop of Albany fell into when he declared it to be a fact "that to multiply suffrage means to multiply *every kind of vote* by two." Such is *not* the fact. Experience in woman suffrage does not show it. Our knowledge of woman nature tends to prove directly the reverse.

There is, it may safely be asserted, no one question in which women have a greater interest than that governing the sale of liquor. In the abuse of liquor no class in the world suffers as do women. Will it be contended by any one conversant with the facts that if woman is given the ballot each "kind of vote" on this question would be simply multiplied "by two"? Does not our knowledge on the subject lead us to directly the opposite conclusion? Some years ago a crusade was started in a section of this country, by women, against liquor selling. They could not use the ballot in the question, for they did not possess it, and the men voters who (mis)represented them did not agree with them in their views. They therefore adopted a novel plan and proceeded to organize a campaign of prayer against the evil.

Did it succeed? No. Every kind of ridicule was thrown upon the scheme, and the touching appeals to the Lord of Hosts were met by jeers, hootings, and derision.

Passing through a Western town at the time, I witnessed a sight which went far towards convincing me of the justice of the cause of woman suffrage. Near the depot where the train stopped I was startled at the sight of a group of women quietly kneeling in front of a liquor saloon, and evidently engaged in offering up a prayer in accordance with the resolutions they had formed to try and abate a nuisance which directly affected them, their husbands, brothers, and sons.

Perhaps they ought not to have been there. Perhaps that was not the way to bring about a reform. But it was the way they had concluded to try, and their method was entitled to a decent respect, even if none was felt by their chivalric representatives for the Power to whom their appeal was made.

The scene was a singular and novel one: the group of silent kneeling women; the lounging liquor-dealers looking on placidly from the doors and windows, and the crowd of men and boys gazing on. Suddenly the silence was broken by the sound of music approaching, and in a few moments a brass band, surrounded by a noisy rabble of boys, came sweeping round the corner of the street, halting close to the kneeling women. The band continued to play a loud, rollicking air, which drowned every other sound, as our train pulled out of the station.

The band, I presume, had a right to be in the street. It had a right also to play

"We'll never get drunk any more,"

or any other roistering tune its leader chose. But the outrage was none the less a great one, and one which never could or would have been perpetrated if these kneeling women and their sisters had possessed the right of franchise. Surely it will not be claimed by anybody that this is a case where chivalric representation would be of any service, or where, if the ballot were given to women, the prohibition or temperance vote would be simply multiplied "by two."

In this matter of the franchise, if justice is the aim, why should we bestow the ballot upon ignorance and deny it to intelligence? Why bestow it upon one who, in this nineteenth century, proclaims, in the face of all evidence to the contrary,

that the sun revolves about the earth, *because he is a man*, and refuse it to one whose burning words in the cause of freedom have been translated into every living language on the face of the earth, *because she is a woman?*

When the war closed, many millions of men and women were made free. In order to enable them to protect their freedom, it was deemed necessary to place the ballot in the hands of the free*men*. It did not apparently matter so much about the women; because, it is presumed, it was thought they could protect themselves or could lean upon the *chivalry* of the men. With all the power of the United States to back up the government, the black man had still for his protection to be endowed with the ballot. The women could get along without it, because they were *women*. The only qualifications were that the voter should be of age—and a *man*. It would have been well to add another qualification—that he should be able to read and write.

The next time we extend the suffrage it is to be hoped we will not repeat the same mistake, but bestow on women who can read and write the right to cast a ballot. Once in possession of the franchise, it would be strange, indeed, if she did not make a better use of it than ignorance and degradation have ever succeeded in doing.

That the day for the enfranchisement of women in this country is coming cannot be doubted by any one capable of reading the very apparent signs which have been shown for some years past. One of the most remarkable of these signs is the desperate struggle those opposed to woman suffrage are making to prevent its accomplishment. Desperate struggles are not made against attacks less formidable and persistent than those which have been waged so long in favor of placing woman on the same legal level with man, by putting in her hand the only weapon competent for her protection. These attacks in favor of the right of franchise have been varied in their success, but as a whole the advance has been marked and such as to excite the apprehension of the opponents of the measure, who are driven to forecast all sorts of imaginary evils as sure to follow the inauguration of this new and "untried" system of voting.

JOHN GIBBON.

SOUND MONEY THE SAFEGUARD OF LABOR.

BY THE HON. ROWLAND B. MAHANY.

THE advocates of silver iterate and reiterate one cry—that gold is the money of the bankers, but silver is the money of the people.

This misleading declaration is cunningly advanced to distort into an argument for silver the fact that, even when the metals circulate at a parity—that is, on an equality of values—the gold coins being in the main of larger denominations (usually five and ten dollar pieces), the silver dollars have a greater currency among the people, simply because of greater convenience in the making of change or the settlement of small transactions. This convenience becomes at once a secondary consideration when the value or purchasing power of silver is impaired.

This government is now on a gold basis; that is to say, the nation stands pledged to redeem all its debts or obligations in gold. This is not the result of arbitrary legislation on our part, but a necessity imposed by the demands of trade and commerce. Foreign purchasers of American products pay in gold, and foreign creditors demand settlements in the same metal.

How would the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one affect our business, and especially our industrial conditions?

The advocates of silver ask the government of the United States to declare by law that sixteen ounces of silver are equal to one ounce of gold; whereas it takes in the neighborhood of thirty-one ounces of silver to purchase an ounce of gold in any market of the world, American or European. We are, then, to discard our present gold standard, recognized and honored in every business center on earth, and to adopt a fiat standard, recognized nowhere at its stamped value, not even among ourselves.

Who would be the chief sufferer by such a policy?

Not the banker or capitalist, against whom the silver people are attempting to raise such hue and cry. The brains that understand finance and accumulate great fortunes can be depended upon to escape with a minimum of loss; but the maximum of disaster would fall upon the American laborer.

The moment the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one is adopted, that moment, in all the markets of the world, our silver dollar will be rated, not at its stamped value, but at its real value of 51 or 52 cents. Sixteen ounces of silver are worth only about one-half of an ounce of gold, and hence our silver dollar at the ratio of sixteen to one will be worth only about one-half of a gold dollar. Every man who has a dollar in gold will keep it, if he can pay his debts with a silver dollar worth only half as much as the gold dollar. This will withdraw gold from circulation here; and gradually all our gold—about $659,000,000 in coin and bullion—will cross the Atlantic to pay our foreign obligations that are redeemable only in that metal.

The withdrawal of our gold coin (aggregating $620,000,000) now in circulation would shrink our currency to the extent of one-third. This disturbance of our financial system would be rendered the more appalling by the immediate shrinkage in the value of our silver coin to one-half of its present purchasing power. The financial stringency of 1893 would be reproduced on a gigantic scale. Depositors in banks would demand the payment of their deposits in gold. Runs on these institutions would cause fifty per cent of them to close their doors. Notes could not be discounted, and employers doing business on a credit basis would fail. Workingmen would be thrown out of employment. Rates of interest would go up as the general ability to endure the burden declined. Crash and panic—each producing the other—would be the continuous order of the hour.

This state of affairs would be the first calamity to fall on American labor from the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. The long train of consequent and subsequent evils almost defies description.

To Mexicanize our money means to Mexicanize our labor. It is a fact deduced from universal history that the rates of wages do not increase in proportion as the money in which they are paid decreases in value. There are few things slower than a rise in wages while the commodities or necessaries of life for which these

wages are expended fluctuate in price from day to day. There are few things swifter than a decrease of wages in hard times. There is nothing that produces hard times more quickly than an unstable or fluctuating currency. It unsettles securities and deters investments. It destroys confidence, which is the mother of business enterprise.

That the American workingman, therefore, should desire the establishment of the least variable standard of currency seems to be the plainest proposition of common sense. The dollar paid to him in wages should be equal in purchasing power at all times and everywhere to that paid to the owner of a bond. A day's labor is the same in physical exhaustion whether the compensation for it is in dollars worth fifty cents or in dollars worth one hundred cents. What is more important, therefore, to the laborer than that the money standard of his wages shall be as fixed as the labor for which those wages are paid?

When there are two kinds of money, one cheaper than the other, capital will always endeavor to pay labor in the poorer currency, and to secure its own profits in the better. In addition to that, the laborer, under the silver *régime*, would be forever at the mercy of the market manipulators in exchange rates, and every disaster that occurred to depress industry would drive down the price of silver and force up the price of gold. The laborer, however, cannot hold his silver money until the market takes an upward turn for that metal. Unlike the rich man, the laborer, having but little money, must pay as he goes. He must part with his wages for the necessaries of life. When the market price of silver is down, he gets so much less for his money. In which currency, therefore, should labor, from any standpoint of common sense, desire to be paid?

Gold in all history has been the one universally accepted medium of international exchange. Until there is some agreement among the countries of the earth for international bimetallism, gold will remain the standard money of the nations. Labor, accordingly, should not be satisfied unless the reward of toil is paid in dollars that everywhere pass current at one hundred cents apiece. The American workingman should ponder the fact that poor money is the poorest agency in making poor people rich.

ROWLAND B. MAHANY.

PETTICOAT GOVERNMENT.

BY MAX O'RELL.

WITH COMMENTS BY MRS. H. P. SPOFFORD AND MRS. MARGARET BOTTOME, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER OF KING'S DAUGHTERS AND SONS.

I.

I LOATHE the domination of woman, but I ever crave for her influence, and I believe that any man of refinement and thinking, that any lover and admirer of woman, will echo this sentiment.

I know of one country only where the government by woman was given a real trial, and that is New Zealand. The law was passed and the experiment was made. The law had to be repealed after six months. The government had taken such a tyrannical form that that loveliest of spots on the earth was on the eve of a revolution, of a desperate struggle for liberty.

Things were pretty badly managed in a small Ohio city when I was visiting it four years ago. The following year women put up their names as candidates for the City Council in every ward and were all returned. They did manage the city. The following year the experiment had been made, and not one woman was returned again.

The American men are so busy, so long absent from home, that many of their womankind have to find out a way of using the leisure time left at their disposal, with results that are not always altogether satisfactory. Some devote that time to literature, to the improvement of their brilliant native intellect; some spend it in frivolities; some indulge in all the fads of Anglo-Saxon life.

The women of good society in America are what they are

everywhere else, satisfied with their lot which consists in being the adored goddesses of refined households; but there exists in this country, among the middle—perhaps what I should call in European parlance, lower-middle—classes, restless, bumptious, ever poking-their-noses-everywhere women who are slowly, but surely and safely, transforming this great land of liberty into a land of petty, fussy tyranny, and trying, often with complete success, to impose on the community fads of every shape and form.

If there is one country in the world where the women appear, in the eyes of the foreign visitor, to enjoy all manner of privileges and to have the men in leading strings, that country is America. You would imagine, therefore, that America should be the last country where the "new woman" was to be found airing her grievances. Yet she is flourishing throughout the length and breadth of this huge continent. She is petted by her husband, the most devoted and hard-working of husbands in the world; she is literally covered with precious stones by him. She is allowed to wear hats that would "fetch" Paris in Carnival time, or start a panic at a *Corpus-Christi* procession in Paris or a Lord-Mayor's Show in London. She is the superior of her husband in education, and almost in every respect. She is surrounded by the most numerous and delicate attentions. Yet she is not satisfied.

The Anglo-Saxon "new woman" is the most ridiculous production of modern times and destined to be the most ghastly failure of the century. She is *par excellence* the woman with a grievance, and self-labelled the greatest nuisance of modern society. The new woman wants to retain all the privileges of her sex and secure, besides, all those of man. She wants to be a man and to remain a woman. She will fail to become a man, but she may succeed in ceasing to be a woman.

And, now, where is that "new woman" to be found? Put together a hundred women, intelligent and of good society; take out the beautiful ones, then take out the married ones who are loved by their husbands and their children, and kindly seek the "new woman" among what is left—ugly women, old maids, and disappointed wives.

Woman has no grievance against man. Her only grievance should be, I admit, against Nature, which made her different from man; with duties different, physically and otherwise,

almost always to her disadvantage. The world exists and marches on through love. I pity from the bottom of my heart the good woman who is not to know the whispers of love of a good husband or the caresses of little children, but I am not prepared to see life become a burden for her sake.

There is no possibility of denying or ignoring the fact. The purpose, the *raison d'être,* of woman is to be a mother, as the *raison d'être* of a fruit tree is to bear fruit. And woe to the next generations; for everybody knows that *only* the children of quiet and reposed women are healthy and intelligent.

The woman question will only be solved by the partnership in life of man and wife, as it exists in France, where, thank God! the "new woman" is unknown; by the equality of the sexes, but each with different, well-defined duties to perform.

The "new woman" is not to be found outside of Great Britain, where woman is her husband's inferior, and of the United States, where she is his superior.

The woman who devotes a good deal of her time to the management of public affairs is a woman who is not required to devote much of it to private ones.

Show me a woman of forty!

Look on this picture: eyes bright, beaming with joy and happiness, complexion clear, rosy, plump, not a wrinkle, mouth smiling. See her lips bearing the imprint of holy kisses, and her neck the mark of her little children's arms. She has no grievance. Ask her to join the "new woman" army. "No, thanks," she will say with a smile of pity, "the old style is good enough for me."

And on this: thin, sallow complexion, eyes without lustre, wrinkled, mouth sulky, haughty, the disgust of life written on every feature. That woman will join the ranks of every organization which aims at taking the cup of love away from the lips of every happy being.

But all this might take the shape of a long digression. Let us see how some American women devote part of the time which they are not probably wanted to devote at home.

I think that of all the grand fads indulged in by some women in America the palm should be given to the compulsory water-drinking work. That is a colossal illustration of what women can do when left entirely to their own resources.

Now, I will lay down as a sort of principle that the "temperance" woman and the teetotaler are not to be found in refined society, and I don't think that in saying so, I shall run the risk of being contradicted. I have often been a guest at the Union Club, the Union League Club, the Manhattan, the Century, the Players, and many other good clubs, I have dined in the best houses of the great American cities, and nowhere have I met teetotalers in those circles of society. Refined, intelligent people of good society, artists, literary men are not teetotalers; that will be granted by everybody. I don't mention politicians, even of the best class, who have at times to be teetotalers to catch votes in a democracy.

The smaller towns of America—and that is America proper—are ruled by fussy, interfering faddists, fanatics of all sorts, old women of both sexes, shrieking cockatoos that will by-and-by make life well-nigh intolerable to any man of self-respect and make him wonder whether he lives in a free country or not.

Take two lively illustrations. A few months ago I was in the town of E. (Kansas). There was a mayor who was married, and the happy pair had a little boy. That little boy was a wicked little boy. One day he was caught smoking a cigarette. Now what should be done by sensible parents to such a wicked little boy? Why, he should be turned over and given a good hearty—you know! This is not at all what was done. The mayor's wife called up a meeting of women, made a violent speech on the pernicious habit of cigarette smoking, and it was decided to petition the mayor and ask him to forbid the sale of cigarettes within the precincts of his jurisdiction. For the sake of peace and happiness at home, the worthy mayor published an edict prohibiting the sale of cigarettes in his district. However, cigarettes can be had in the town of E., but you have to walk nearly a mile, just outside the limits of the mayor's jurisdiction, to find a store where a roaring trade in cigarettes is done. All the same, you must admit that it is a nuisance to be obliged to walk a mile, in a free country, to buy a little article of luxury that you indulge in, without ever abusing it, because there happens to be in the town a wicked little boy that once smoked a cigarette.

When I was in the town of T. (Arkansas), only a few weeks ago, I gave a lecture under the auspices of "temperance" ladies of the city. They called on me.

Being of a rather inquisitive turn of mind, I said to them: "Now, ladies, I understand I am in a prohibition State. How do you account for your existence? Do you wish now to advocate the suppression of tea, coffee and icewater, which, I must say, would go a long way toward improving the complexion and the digestive apparatus of your fellow-creatures?"

"No," they said; "we find that, in spite of the law, there is liquor, wine and beer still sold in this town, and we want to put a stop to it."

I knew that such was the case, for I had, *proh pudor!* a bottle of lager beer in my pocket which I had bought for my dinner, but which, I am glad to say, was not discovered by the ladies under the auspices of whom I was to lecture in the evening. I can do with ice-water, but in a prohibition State I cannot. The evil spirit prompts me. I must have beer or wine with my meals. I have never been drunk in my life; but if I ever get drunk, it will be in a prohibition State.

"Well," said the lady president of the temperance society of the town of T., "could you believe that, a few days ago, a poor woman of the town and her children actually died of starvation, while every day her husband got drunk with the wages he received?"

"But," I mildly suggested, "you should see that that man was punished, not the innocent population of this town. Don't suppress the wine, which is a gift of God: punish—suppress, even, if you like—the drunkard. It is not wine that makes a man drunk, it is vice. Don't suppress the wine, suppress the vice, or the vicious. Imprison a drunkard, lynch him, hang, shoot him, quarter him, do what you like with him, but allow hundreds of good, wise, temperate people, who would use wine in moderation, to indulge in a habit that makes men moderate, cheerful and happy."

My argument was lost on them.

Every year there are men who use knives to stab fellow-creatures; but there are millions who use their knives to eat their meals peacefully with. The law punishes the criminals, but would not think of suppressing the knives.

Any law is bad that punishes, injures, or annoys thousands of good, innocent people in order to stop the mischief done by a few —a very few, after all—blackguards and scoundrels.

These Christian ladies left me certainly unconverted, and took their revenge by not paying me my fee after the lecture, which confirmed me in my firm resolution never to have anything to do with angels—this side of the grave.

The Anglo-Saxon should by all means preach temperance, which means moderation, not total abstinence. What they preach overreaches the mark and does no good. When you say that a country enjoys a *temperate* climate, that does not mean that it has no climate at all, but enjoys a moderate one, neither too hot nor too cold.

These same Anglo-Saxons should not despise, but admire and envy, those who can enjoy, like men of understanding, like gentlemen, the glorious gifts of God to man without ever making fools of themselves. For these, the law should be made.

If your husband or son, dear lady, would like to have a glass of wine or beer with his dinner, let him have it in your sweet and wholesome presence. Don't make a hypocrite of him. Don't compel him to go and hide himself in his club or, worse, in a saloon, or, worse still, don't allow him to go and lose his manhood's dignity by crawling on all fours under the counter of a drug-store.

There is no virtue in compulsion. There is virtue only in liberty.

Ah! how I remember admiring, in the hot days of blue-ribbonism in England, that free Briton I once met who had a yellow ribbon in his button hole.

"What's that you have on?" I said to him.

"That's a yellow ribbon," he replied. "I belong to the yellow ribbon army."

"Ah, and what is it the yellow-ribbon army do?" I inquired.

"What do we do?" he said, "Why, we eat what we likes, we drink what we likes and we don't care a —— for nobody."

There are well-meaning, most highly estimable and talented ladies who go about the world preaching temperance, that is to say, total abstinence, not moderation.

Now, as a rule, these ladies have special reasons for so doing. Very often they have led a life of sorrow and misery with wretched husbands, and they should be pitied. But hundreds of thousands of women have good husbands who have not to be cured of habits which they never in their lives indulged in, and

who would be condemned to deny themselves every little luxury that helps make life cheerful when used with moderation and discretion, if the preachings of these often unfortunate ladies were to take the shape of laws.

I have often had to listen to self-confessed, reformed drunkards who preached to me who never was once drunk in my life. The thing is ludicrous.

There exist, among the Anglo-Saxons, people to whom the strains of Wagner and Beethoven's music say absolutely nothing, to whom the Venus of Milo is indecent. They declare music and the fine arts immoral, and if they had their way, they would close the concert halls and the museums on every day of the week. Because their minds are distorted, foul and even dirty, they would condemn people with lofty and artistic minds to never hear a masterpiece of music or behold a masterpiece of painting or statuary. I have met people who declared they would never again set foot inside the walls of the Louvre and of the British Museum. And if the Anglo-Saxon fanatics, those arch enemies of art, make a little more progress, the future of that great Institution, the British Institution, is not safe.

As everybody knows, there exist, in Great Britain and in America, thousands of people who declare the stage to be a most wicked and immoral institution. I have on the subject a rather pleasant reminiscence which illustrates how the Anglo-Saxons can combine the spirit of morality with the spirit of business. I once gave a lecture, in a town of some twenty thousand inhabitants in the State of Kansas, under the auspices of a society of lady reformers. They had engaged the Opera House for the occasion. I arrived at the theatre a few minutes after eight. The ladies in charge were in the ticket-office pocketing money as fast as they could. To my great gratification there was an immense house, which was due, no doubt, far more to the popularity of the ladies' philanthropic cause than to my own modest personality. When the crowd was in and seated, I asked to be led to the stage, and I said to the lady president of the society: "I suppose you have your seats reserved." "No," she replied, "I have not. I don't think I will go in, if you will excuse me. I am proud to say that I have never once in my life set foot inside a theatre." I literally collapsed. There were in that theatre some twelve hun-

dred people whom these good ladies had induced to "sin" to fill the coffers of their society.

All these movements, headed by women, are in the wrong direction. They interfere with the liberties of a great people, and punish thousands and thousands of good, orderly, well-behaved people, to reach a score or two of bad ones, whom they often fail to reach and oftener still fail to cure. I repeat it, there are many hundreds of good people in this world for a very few hundreds of bad ones. The laws should aim at reaching the former and protecting them. This world is considerably better than the fanatics of all denominations and superstitions would make us believe. For eleven years, I have travelled all over the world, and I have never met any but honorable people to deal with. For instance, I have given 1,272 lectures in my life, and only once did I come across a man who behaved dishonestly toward me. He ran away with the cash while I was speaking; but then it was on Sunday and some good pious people said to me that God, in his wisdom, had punished me for my wickedness. I must say that I never could see very clearly why God, in his wisdom, should have allowed the thief to safely run away with the money; but the ways of Providence are impenetrable, and its decrees should not be discussed. I might add that the lecture was more of a harmless address—almost a little sermon on the duty of Cheerfulness; but two or three times it caused the audience to smile, and this is simply too awful to think of.

Yes, the world is good, very good, in spite of the calumnies that are constantly hurled at its face by the Pharisees of Anglo-Saxondom. Yes, full of good men, crammed with good women, and the excellent ladies of the Philanthropic societies of America should take it for granted that there are many, many good and virtuous people besides themselves.

You don't cut down an apple tree because there are two or three bad apples on it. You cut down the two or three bad apples, and all your efforts tend to see that the hundreds of good ones are made healthy, happy, and comfortable.

I have no hesitation in declaring, after five visits to this great and most hospitable country, that the American women of good society are probably the most intelligent, bright, and brilliant, and certainly the best educated and the most interesting, women in the world.

But when I see what some American women can do in public life, outside of the beautiful sphere in which they were intended to reign supreme, I feel ready to appreciate and echo the remark that Frederick the Great was wont to make when he met a woman alone in the streets of Berlin :

"What are you doing here ? Go home and look after your house and your children."

MAX O'RELL.

II.

I HAVE sat silent at my table and heard foreign guests discuss, in a sweet way they have, the unpleasant points of American character, feeling that the obligations of hospitality and of good manners forbade reproof. But when we are put to open shame in print, the situation is somewhat changed. Still, it would be scarcely worth while to attempt answering the thin tissue of wrong conclusions found in Mr. Max O'Rell's witty, if rather incoherent, little article, if it were not—we will not say, for the old adage that a certain ugly thing can go round the world while the truth is drawing on its boots—but for the fact that his good-natured epigram may impress the superficial reader more strongly than it warrants.

In the first paragraph of this little chat of his, Mr. O'Rell assumes the incorrect postulate that the women of this country wish to govern. He mistakes ; they wish only the liberty to govern themselves and their own interests. He then makes the extraordinary assertion that wherever women have had the chance to govern they have developed a tyranny. Is it then possible that where men govern tyranny is unknown ? The women who are cited in chief support of the statement governed a single year, it appears ; but for how many thousands of years have not men governed, with perpetual revolt against their tyranny ? And are there not still some tolerably despotic examples extant ?

In continuing this line of remark our excursive visitor takes occasion to declare that it is the *raison d'être* of a woman to be a mother ; but he forgets to state that then also it is the *raison d'être* of a man to be a father ; which clears the equation of both members and leaves room for the development of the other affairs of life, perhaps opens the way for surprise that a woman

who is petted and "literally covered with precious stones," should not be entirely satisfied, should not rest content as Fido with his gold collar, his silk cushion, his dish of cream, but should still see some errors to be corrected, and should try to make the way easier for those who are not petted and covered with precious stones. Woman, Mr. O'Rell further says, has a grievance against nature, "which made her different from man." The conceit of it! Ah, and the civility of it!

But really it is Mr. O'Rell himself who has a grievance. And his grievance seems to be that it is difficult in some parts of this country to obtain wine and beer at open tables, which he lays to the account of the exertions of some women and not at all to those of any men. And this reveals the *raison d'être* of his article, which—partly veiled by the slight rankle of an old hostility to the Anglo-Saxon, and by persiflage concerning women, who in one breath are called restless, bumptious, ugly, and dissatisfied, and, in another, bright, interesting, and the superiors of their husbands "in education and in almost every respect,"—is really that of a temperance tract.

Owing to the circumstance that, whether wisely or unwisely, certain women are interested in affairs public if petty, and in addition think it of less moment that he should walk a mile to make his purchase than that a whole generation of boys should be hindered in growth and stupefied in brain, Mr. O'Rell opens on them the vials of his merry wrath, and announces that they all belong to the lower middle class. As one reads, one remembers the exclamation of the young woman to another swift traveller, "What very poor letters of introduction you must have brought!" But it is a gratuitous assumption on the visitor's part. For the first principles of this government make a lower middle class here an impossibility. We do not recognize such a thing. Our government stands upon the will of the mass of the people. Education is within the reach of all. Those who have much property are unlikely to have an education superior to that of those who have little; and we have no other rank than that of education and morality. This is our theory, and we consider anything else unsound, ignoble, and unchristian. Owing to the absence of rights of primogeniture among us, money is too fluctuating an element to succeed in making and perpetuating classes. And although there must always be individual differences and

preferences, yet our women, active in public ways, are as well born and as well bred as those who are not active, and the men who accompany them are their mates in parentage, discretion, and culture.

It is "a sort of principle," Mr. O'Rell says, that the temperance women and the teetotalers are not to be found in refined society. Such a statement shows the folly of accepting evidence on hearsay, of judging from scattered instances, of taking short tours through an immense empire and supposing one's self, however brilliant and kindly and observing—and in candor Mr. O'Rell is all this—able to become sufficiently acquainted with the varieties of type, to generalize from them and arrive at correct results. Mr. O'Rell may return and say without contradiction to his own country-people whatever he chooses, but he should not say to Americans, who know better, that the woman interested in affairs here is fanatic, sour, sallow, thin, wrinkled, unmarried or disappointed in marriage ; or that the woman with her children's arms about her neck finds no incentive to improve the world before they shall go out into it, and to help remove the pitfalls where others have already fallen by the way.

In truth no more complete misstatement could be made than that involved in this "sort of principle." Frances Willard, as attractive now, when she is the "uncrowned queen" of a million followers, as when she was a blooming girl, is the welcome guest of drawing-rooms where the most delicate and cultivated women are proud and glad to meet her. And there is certainly no woman in the world commanding more refined society than Lady Henry Somerset, the daughter of a hundred earls, few lovelier in person and in nature, as earnest in the temperance movement here as in the other Anglo-Saxon stronghold. I mention these prominent names to avoid enumeration of others almost as well known.

Mr. O'Rell is behind the age in America. Time was when "the long-haired man and the short-haired woman" were pierced by the arrows of the scornful ; but they set on foot and accomplished the greatest reform ever wrought in the history of humanity. Now they, and the fashion of them, have gone by. And it is not necessary to tell those that meet them every day, on the street, in the office, the shop, the college, the hospital, the settlement house, that the greater part of the

women who are now taking their place as equal factors of life, of civilization, and of the welfare of the world, are young, well groomed, dressed in the best modes Paris sends us, neglecting none of the duties and none of the delicacies of manners and of living, agreeable, often beautiful, often married, with happy homes perfectly kept, with tender husbands of a nobler sort than they who hold a woman as their plaything and personal property, with dear children whose rosy health attests their care and whose future is their chief concern; when unmarried, remaining single for the same good reason that many men give—because they choose to do so; and, when by chance no longer young, as beautiful and as fine as Mrs. Julia Ward Howe herself. Such women can well afford to dispense with the admiration of one who declares, "Ah! how I remember admiring" the man who said, "We drinks what we likes, and we don't care a —— for nobody!" And such women will decline to accept the smooth and pretty veneer of flattery with which Mr. O'Rell announces that the "American women of good society are probably the most intelligent, bright, and brilliant, and certainly the best educated and the most interesting, women in the world." For they know that there are women of other races all their equals, that the English woman is as well educated, that there is none more interesting than the polished Italian, the Spanish, the German, the Russian, and nowhere any more brilliant than the French woman, after whose sparkle they labor in vain.

H. P. SPOFFORD.

III.

THE request to comment upon Mr. O'Rell's article came to me immediately upon my return from a trip to the Orient; and the women of the East in all their degradation stood before my eyes. I seemed again to see their covered faces. In some instances one can distinguish those of them who are married from those who are unmarried, for the former are all in black. It seemed to be very appropriate that these should be dressed in mourning. They were mere beasts of burden; of not as much worth as the donkeys their husbands rode, while *they* walked! The piercing cry of a Mohammedan mother, as she saw her baby carried to the burial, sounded still in my ears. Her husband and

all the men could enter the mosque, but she must remain without! And I cannot rid myself of the impression that the position of the Western woman will in some way in the future affect the position of her Eastern sisters. The light that comes to us Western women may some day dispel their darkness.

If all that Mr. O'Rell says of the American woman is true, I do not wonder at her unrest. "Petted by her husband, the most devoted and hard-working of husbands in the world, she is literally covered with precious stones. She is the superior of her husband in education and almost in every respect. She is surrounded by the most numerous and delicate attentions, yet she is not satisfied." If she were satisfied, she would be fit only for a harem. The "not being satisfied," of which the writer complains in the Western woman, only proves to my mind that she has a soul. She cares for the less-favored women who are not adorned or covered with jewels. As I write, the face of one of the richest young women of this country comes up before me. We were driving over a part of her great estate and talking on this very subject. I was conservative and spoke of my fears. Her look more than her words told me she was taking in a wider view than I had yet seen. She said: "If such great responsibilities had not been laid on me, I might not feel as I do, but I must act on my deepest convictions." As I think of her face, how I rejoice that it is not with her as with the women of the East who are covered with jewels, who look out of windows so arranged that they can see the great world without being seen by it, or being permitted to influence it! Ah! in the latter part of this nineteenth century, here in the United States, and in Great Britain, covering a woman with precious stones does not answer her nobler needs. She must work to make this world holier. To receive from God and to give out to one's fellows is the only way in which women as well as men can be made happy.

As to the happy wife and mother we are told to look at this picture: "See her lips bearing the imprints of holy kisses, and her neck the marks of the little children's arms." I know women too well to believe that the babies will be neglected, and I know all about the little arms around a mother's neck. But is a mother's interest in what concerns her children to end with their nursery days? Any problem that touches the home concerns her, and it is her duty to take personal interest in it.

And that fact alone justifies women in making their influence felt either in public or private, when the safeguards of home are in danger. And as to those who do enter public life because of their interest in other questions, all I can say is that such of the women who are advocating the cause of suffrage as I personally know, are among the noblest women I have ever met, and there is in them none of the spirit of domination of which the author of "Petticoat Government" complains. They want to help right the wrongs; they want to help in the interest of good government as far as in them lies; for it would seem that those who do not wear petticoats have not yet succeeded in lifting this world into all the light and joy that are needed. It would be too much to hope that all women will be wise; but all men are not wise, or, if they are, it took time to make them so. I wish men could disabuse themselves of the idea that women want to be men. Nothing can ever make a woman aught but a woman, and not many will enter into public life. But I believe that the ideals before those who do enter that life are quite as high as those cherished by their husbands and brothers.

Mr. O'Rell tells us that the new woman is not to be found outside of Great Britain and the United States. So much the worse, then, for other countries! I wish I might have seen some evidence of the new woman in the East! For, let us remember, the real (not the sham) new woman is never a made-up woman. There is nothing unwomanly about her. What we need is more new women; as, just as surely, we need more new men!

Mr. O'Rell says he appreciates and echoes the sentiment of Frederick the Great, who was wont to say when he met a woman alone in the streets of Berlin: "What are you doing here? Go home and look after your house and children." I wonder what Frederick would have said to the thousands of men in clubs who leave their wives at home. Would it have been: "What are you doing here? *Go home to your wives and children.*"

I am making no plea specially for woman suffrage; there may be easily two opinions about that. I do believe, however, that what, as a girl of fifteen, I heard Lucy Stone say, is true: "What a woman can do well, she has a right to do." And what these things are she needs to be told; and she should be encouraged in the doing of them.

MARGARET BOTTOME.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

STORM TRACKS.

THE laws of Nature reveal themselves most clearly in the extremes of their manifestations; and the almost unparalleled recent series of tornadoes elucidates a principle which a few years ago was vaguely pointed out in Professor Grety's remarks on a meteorological phenomenon of the southern Alps.

"Whenever the highlands of Tessino and Savoy are invaded by exceptionally heavy snow falls," he says in a monograph founded on the observations of many years, "the mountaineers look for an early visit of the *Foehn-storm*, the warm south-wind from the Mediterranean, that anticipates the work of the summer sun, and often melts away massive snowbanks in forty-eight hours. That expectation is rarely disappointed. The *Foehn* comes like a prompt answer to the prayers of the snowbound highlanders, and it almost seems as if Nature, in the very act of sending afflictions, contrived to prepare the proper remedy, for the recurrence of the phenomenon is too frequent to doubt the fact that the snow-fields somehow attract the warm sea-wind."

The fact of the coincidence is confirmed by the weather records of half a century, but the suggested explanation is even more unsatisfactory than the ingeniously absurd attempt to account for the frequent alternation of warm and cold years. Severe winters, according to that hypothesis, seal up the outlets of the Arctic seas and thus prevent the icebergs from starting on their southward exodus. Dry, hot summers follow and release the imprisoned air-chillers, which drift equatorward in whole sierras, and naturally treat the summer tourists to a reverse of last year's experience. The originator of that theory may not have overrated the influence of floating ice hills, but overlooked the circumstance that cold winters tend to congeal the waters of the lower latitude and thus prepare abundant consignments of drift ice from less distant sources of supply.

Alpine snow-banks, a dozen feet thick, melt away in early spring with a suddenness that must be seen to be credited, but the *rationale* of their "attraction" for the warm south wind is a little too exclusively teleological. Nearly a century ago the traveler Burkhardt came nearer the true explanation in noticing the frequent reversion of the seastorms that sweep in spring over the plains of the Arabian peninsula. The *tramontana*, as the Italians call the cold wind from the other side of the Alps, is a continuation of the northwest gales that cross the Atlantic in winter and make themselves felt as far south as Cairo and Damascus, fringing the mountain brooks of the Lebanon with icicles, and driving the friars of Mount Sinai to the shelter of their cavern-cells. In cold winters they even invade Arabia,

improving the drinking water of Mecca, and crossing the tableland haunts of the pious Wahabees, but meet their match in the plains of Arabia Deserta. In the Wad-el-Akhaff, or "Sea of Shifting Sands," the intruders from the northwest provoke the fury of counter-currents that not only resist their further progress, but chase them back, all the way across the Mediterranean, over the crests of the Apennines and into the highland glens of the Maritime Alps.

"There comes the *Foehn*," says the highlander, who hears the moaning of the nightwind in the swaying pines; "I did expect that last heavy snow would change the weather."

He instinctively recognizes a causal connection between the two phenomena, though he probably remembers that the last snowfall was attended with violent northwest gales. Less heavy storms from the same direction might mingle with the breezes of the Mediterranean, or spend their force on the ramparts of the Atlas Range; but this last *tramontana* tried to carry its conquests further and awakened the wrath of a counterblast. On the same principle an earthquake shock, after hurling back the waters of the ocean, evokes a reflux wave like that which overwhelmed Lisbon in 1755, and the seaports of Peru in 1823. Compressed steam recoils with force sufficient to turn the wheels of the heaviest machinery, and the pressure of conflicting air-currents initiates the rotary storms known as tornadoes or cyclones. The violence of such storms is proportioned to the degree of atmospheric resistance, for the same reason that powder, ignited in light package, merely flares up, but explodes with destructive force against an unyielding obstacle.

In the Indian Ocean, where trespass-freaks of the trade-winds encounter the expanding atmospheric strata of heated coast plains, the typhoon often rages with a fury "as if heaven and earth were going to return to their original chaos," and the recent monster gales, too, may be ascribed to a reaction against an excess of persistent air-currents.

The preceding six months had been abnormally warm. Since 1847 our Western and Middle States had not experienced anything like a similar mild winter. In the river counties of Kentucky, from Louisville down, the weather remained so warm that Indian summer and spring might be said to have met. In some of the Tennessee mountain districts black cattle were left to shift for themselves, and, in fact, found many too much better things to touch hay. Swarms of robins from the Yankee States went as far south as Alabama and there stopped to enjoy all the comforts of the Mexican tropics; squirrels exhausted their winter store before the middle of January, and had to return to their scraping grounds, like the California miners to the "tailings" of '49; birch trees put forth new leaves; children sent to the hills to replenish the salt-logs returned with bunches of violets; the old inhabitants did not know what to make of it and would not risk a prediction, for the prophetic groundhog, too, had refused to be stabled.

Here and there professional weather-augurs, indeed, expressed a misgiving that the strange winter would be followed by a queer spring, but the fulfillment of that prophecy came in a rather unexpected manner.

"Bluebells at Christmas, sleighbells at Easter,"

—but Easter Sunday was ushered in by mid-summer-night dreams. The growlers who had protested against the mild winter had real cause to complain of the hot spring. All through Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Kansas, April was a summer month. In the Southern Alleghanies the

slumbering wood-nymphs awakened at least six weeks ahead of date; and on a trip from Lexington to Chattanooga I saw the foliage, flowers, and berries advanced before the end of April to the June status of ordinary years. The strawberry planters of Eastern Virginia had a splendid crop, but their prestige for once did not avail them against their inland competitors. Early berry-weather had prevailed from Cape Hatteras to the valley of the upper Missouri.

And throughout that precocious summer, south and southeast winds prevailed against the usual westerly gales. Tentative changes of programme were followed by a swift relapse. Twice in March and once in April the wind veered to the northwest, but the expected "three days' norther" was nipped in the bud before it could do any nipping of its own. Like a well entrenched conqueror the East American sirocco defied revolts. Its "sphere of influence," as the African land-grabbers would express it, extended further and further West, and might have held its own till the arrival of re-inforcements from the throne of the summer-solstice, if in the plenitude of its power it had not undertaken to measure its strength against the barbarians of the far north. About the middle of May air-waves of a semi-tropical temperature invaded Canada, and frightened the grain-farmers of the Red River Valley with the prospect of a severe drought, but caught a Tartar on the shores of Lake Winnipeg. The great woodland of the Northwest evolved areas of cool air that resisted coercion, and finally exploded upon the intruder with an energy that reversed the atmospheric currents of the whole Mississippi Valley, as far as Arkansas and northern Texas.

There, in the valley of another Red River, the defeated sirocco made a stand, and on the evening of May 15 burst upon the city of Sherman, Tex., and across the river into the plains of Indian Territory, as if it had tried to regain the lost ground by a single mighty effort. In Grayson County (Sherman) alone 120 persons were killed outright; the towns of Howe, Denton, Gribble Springs, and Justin were almost blown off the face of the earth, and the storm ended with torrents of rain that buried the ruins under hillocks of driftwood. Capt. W. S. Bostwick, of Sherman, describes the force of the first storm-blasts as equal to that of an avalanche. "A moment after I heard the rush of the whirlwind," he says, "I saw Mr. Berger's house blown into the air, and then Mr. Shearer's house. Trees and big timbers were whirled by like dry twigs, and just as I called to my folks to run for life, I felt our own walls shake. Then came an awful crash and a sense of suffocation, our house was gone, and myself and family were scattered about the yard under the débris."

Yet that fearful storm was far surpassed by the tornado which a few days after confirmed the repulse of the southern air-currents.

The afternoon of Wednesday, May 27th, had been unusually warm all through eastern Missouri. At 4 P. M. a thermometer in the shade of a leafy porch on the Old Manchester Road, St. Louis, rose to 96 degrees Fahrenheit, but gradually fell to 92 degrees, when the sun was blotted out by a dark cloud rising over Forest Park, in the west. Towards that cloud a brisk southeast wind suddenly set in, and thus started the great battle of the storm giants. Warmed by its contact with the atmosphere of the sweltering city, the southeast breeze rose, leaving a vacuum through which the pent-up air-strata in the northwest rushed in as through a floodgate. Cottages, trees, and lumber piles came whirling through the air like chaff, and the next minute the roar of the tornado mingled with the crash of larger buildings

and the fearful shrieks of panic-stricken fugitives. "Don't come near that wall—it's giving way!" yelled an overseer when a swarm of fugitives made a dash for the shelter of a westside factory—"down, quick; fling yourselves down flat and clutch the grass!" But even that expedient failed of its purpose, and many prostrate refugees were torn up and whirled away like paper dolls. A sailor of the steamer "D. H. Pike" grappled the railing of the hatchway, but the cyclone broke his grip and saved his life by flinging him overboard, for ten minutes after the steamer came drifting down the river, bottom up. Twenty-six other vessels were utterly demolished; the river resembled a pool choked with the drift of a swollen mountain-torrent. In East St. Louis houses of two and three stories were blown down in rows; smaller buildings were scattered like card-houses, especially in the suburbs, where the storm was not checked by the barrier of massive blocks, and had things all its own way.

The fearful destructiveness of its full-sweep blasts may be inferred from the fact that they rent the solid masonry of the Eads Bridge—masonry designed to resist floods and drift-ice—and almost choked the shore-channels with rock avalanches. Where the cement had resisted demolition, the blocks of hard stone had been broken off as if by hammer-strokes. Four trains, together with the fragments of trucks and express wagons were piled up in front of the Vandalia freight depot; and in the two cities at least four hundred persons were killed on the spot.

Destructive storms also raged in Oklahoma, Iowa, Southern Illinois, Michigan, Kentucky, and Alabama, involving a loss of many millions and of an aggregate of at least a thousand human lives.

With few exceptions, the direction of these gales was either from north to south, or from west to east, thus revealing their ultimate cause as a reaction against the abnormally continued southeast winds of the preceding six or seven months. Two other remarkable analogies have been also noticed in the circumstance that five of the six most violent storms were preceded by oppressively warm weather, and that their proximate cause—their local provocation, as it were—was a gust of wind from a southeasterly direction. Four times they developed their main force in crossing a broad river valley.

F. L. OSWALD.

A PRESIDENT OF NO IMPORTANCE.

IT is often a source of surprise to travelers in Switzerland, to find that even Swiss people of more than ordinary intelligence do not seem to know, or to care, who may be their President at any particular time.

Such indifference seems incredible to Americans, because they have not learned that the Swiss political system is the least personal in the world; that its nominal head is, indeed, a President of no importance.

The truth is, the constitution of Switzerland does not intrust the executive power of the government to one man, but to a Federal Council of seven members, acting as a sort of Board of Administration. These seven men are elected for a term of three years by the two legislative houses, composing the Federal Assembly, united in joint session. Any Swiss citizen, except a clergyman, is eligible to the Federal Council, but not more than one member can be chosen from the same Canton. Vacancies are filled at the first ensuing session of the Federal Assembly, for the remainder of the term of office.

Now, the President presides at the meetings of this Federal Council. There is also a Vice-President. The election of these two officers is characteristically Swiss, and is designed to create as little disturbance as possible in the governmental machine.

Every year the two legislative houses designate from among the seven members of the Federal Council the two men who shall act as President and Vice-President. In point of fact, therefore, the President of the Swiss Republic is only the chairman of an executive board; he sits at the head of the table; he receives a salary of $2,160, while his colleagues must content themselves with $1,920; he acts as a figurehead, to which foreign nations can address themselves; but he cannot be his own immediate successor. The members of the Federal Council also have the right to introduce bills or resolutions into the two houses, and to speak upon such bills or resolutions, though not to vote upon them. In return they may be interpellated upon any question.

Translated into the terms of American political life, the Swiss system means that the Senate and the House of Representatives, united in joint session, elect every three years a Cabinet of seven members, not more than one member from the same State. Every year Congress also designates the two men among the seven who shall act as President and Vice-President. The members of the Cabinet have the right to introduce bills into Congress, but not to vote. They can be called to account for the conduct of their offices.

Once elected, the seven members of the Swiss Federal Council distribute the work to be done into seven departments of (1) Foreign Affairs; (2) Interior; (3) Justice and Police; (4) Military; (5) Imposts and Finance; (6) Industry and Agriculture; (7) Posts and Railroads. The President, of course, holds one of these portfolios. A quorum consists of four members.

This Swiss Executive is quite unique among the various types of government. It seems to combine much of the stability of monarchical forms with the elasticity of the purest democracies. It is essentially a business arrangement. Should the bills introduced by members of the Federal Council be defeated, that body does not resign, as would be the case with ministries in England, France and other European countries. Indeed, one of the chief merits of the Federal Council is its independence of party mechanism. The seven members are not the nominees of one political party, but are recruited from several by mutual compromise, in order to represent various parts of the country and different interests. Moreover, the existence of the Initiative and Referendum also tends to free the Federal Council from the dictates of party bosses, for refuge can always be had in a popular verdict.

The Initiative means that fifty thousand voters shall have the right to *initiate* or propose the enactment, the abolition or the alteration of certain articles of the Federal Constitution. But, as the Swiss Constitution is comparatively loosely drawn, almost any subject may thus be introduced into legislation.

The Referendum means that Federal laws shall be *referred* to the people for acceptance or rejection, if the demand is made by thirty thousand voters or by eight Cantons.

Another characteristic of the Swiss people is their horror of anything like one-man power. Only once during their history have they accepted the rule of a chief magistrate, and that innovation was forced upon them by

Napoleon I. during his career of conquest in Europe, when he held undisputed sway in Switzerland. But no sooner had he fallen at Waterloo, than they straightway abolished the office. In the same way, the Cantons of the Republic, corresponding to our States, are administered by executive boards in which the chairman is called sometimes Landammann, sometimes Schultheiss, or merely President; but in no case do his powers approach those of one of our State Governors.

Turning from the executive power in Switzerland to the corresponding factor in the government of the United States, we are confronted by a very interesting contrast. Is it possible that two countries, calling themselves Republics, can vary so much in the attributes of their Presidential offices?

The President of the United States is commander-in-chief of the army and navy; possesses a suspensory veto upon federal legislation and the privilege of pardoning offences against federal law; and finally is intrusted with an appointing power, unparalleled in any free country. He invites certain of his political friends to form a cabinet around him—his control over them being absolute. They are responsible solely to him, not to the nation. He furthermore appoints the Justices of the Supreme Court, so that even the highest judicial authority in the land is to some extent under his influence.

But, as though these sovereign attributes were not sovereign enough, a tendency has shown itself recently to invest the President of the United States with military powers in times of peace, never yet accorded to the head of any constitutional country. The financial policy of the United States is also being shifted by degrees into his hands, to be shaped by him, if he chooses, in entire disregard of the legislative branch of the government. This drift might not be so disastrous, were our successive Presidents in any sense true representatives of the nation. Unfortunately they must remain partisans, even while in office, by reason of the manner of their election. They are obliged to consult the demands of their particular factions, at the expense of public interest, if need be, because they cannot escape pre-election pledges or party pressure.

In dwelling upon these characteristics of the Presidential position, the writer does not wish to be understood as referring to any particular incumbent of that office, past or present. The purpose in view is merely to point out that the requirements are entirely beyond the capabilities even of our great men. No one can be expected to possess the profound and diversified knowledge of men and things which, to speak of but one difficulty, the wholesale distribution of offices, for example, presupposes.

It is no exaggeration to describe the President of the United States as a Partisan-King.

The question, then, naturally arises, whether the Swiss Federal Council does not present valuable suggestions to us in our Presidential predicament.

Here is the oldest Republic in existence, whose governmental experiments necessarily cover a wide field, managing to elect every three years a strong, able executive board of seven men, without a popular upheaval, without the expenditure of vast sums of money, or the wholesale distribution of spoils! It is satisfied to leave the choice of this board to the discretion of the representatives elected by the people. It finds plenty of men of ability and integrity, who feel honored to serve their country on this board for a small salary, because there is no mud slinging before election, and no persecution by hungry office seekers afterwards. It has discovered

that national interests are best served by the retention of well-tried officials. As a bank, or any other business concern, prospers year in and year out under the management of the same Board of Directors, so does the Swiss Government under a Federal Council which rarely changes.

Switzerland's nominal head, this President of no importance, is an official who has no *ex-officio* rank in the army, who cannot launch a veto, or pardon a criminal; who has no offices to distribute, never chooses his associates in the Federal Council, and would consider it a public crime to try to influence the judiciary. As an individual, he cannot declare war or make peace; nor could he, by himself, determine the financial policy of the country. In fact, his position will even appear to many to be that of a political nonentity, until it is remembered that the Federal Council, of which he forms a part, is in reality an exceedingly powerful body, in whose hands the supreme direction of the country rests.

In their general political make-up, the Swiss Republic and the United States resemble each other more nearly than any two countries in the world, so that the two can well afford to learn from each other, without lowering their dignity. It may not be generally known that the bi-cameral system of the Swiss Government, for example, is a direct copy of our own Congress.

Up to 1848 the Swiss had always contented themselves with one legislative body (such as the Cantons have to this day), but when the revision of the Federal Constitution was undertaken in that year, students of international politics, men like Bluntschli and Rüttimann, declared themselves in favor of the creation of a second body. They pointed especially to the Senate of the United States. As a result, Switzerland adopted a bi-cameral system, consisting of a National Council, chosen in the ratio of one member for each twenty thousand persons of the total population, fractions of upwards of ten thousand persons being reckoned at twenty thousand; and of a Council of States, consisting of two representatives from each Canton, making a total of forty-four members.

The lesson which the Swiss Federal Council teaches us at this hour is that a Republic can unite incongruous, often antagonistic, elements in population, such as Switzerland possesses, and protect itself from foreign complications without indulging in a powerful and spectacular public head. Instead of increasing the responsibilities and sovereign attributes of the Presidential office, as we in this country seem inclined to do under the stress of military excitement and of financial fear, let his prerogatives rather be checked and his official burdens lightened. At present none but a mental, moral, and physical giant can ever hope to fill the office satisfactorily.

W. D. McCRACKAN.

THE NECESSITY OF LIMITING RAILWAY COMPETITION.

THE interstate commerce law, during the nine years since it was placed upon the statute book, has accomplished much that tends to justify the hopes of its advocates, and has even obtained from many of its opponents tardy acknowledgment of the wisdom and justice of its fundamental principles. The practice of charging more for a short intermediate haul of freight or passenger traffic than for a longer one in the same direction, which was among those appearing most unjust and consequently obnoxious to the general public, has been restricted to fewer instances and to those in which the circumstances of competition afford more apparent justification.

The subjection of particular communities to disadvantage, by means of unjust discriminations in the relative adjustment of railway rates, has been discontinued in numerous instances to the practical benefit of the localities formerly discriminated against, and of the entire country, which is thus assured a more natural and symmetrical development. The tendency toward harmony in the charges for carrying competing commodities, different grades of the same article, and raw materials and their finished products, has been intensified by the acquiescence of railway managers in the spirit of the law, and its operation mildly accelerated by the adjudication of the complaints presented to the Commission created for its enforcement. The custom of making special rates to favored shippers, so prevalent prior to the enactment of the law that regular charges were exacted only from occasional and unsophisticated shippers, has been so far corrected that the vastly greater portion of all traffic is now charged full published rates and the law deviated from only in cases of most strenuous competition, when failure to yield to the force of conditions imposed by an unnatural, extravagant and wasteful rivalry, that is itself the creature of unwise legislation, would entail serious financial loss. Doubtless the preservation of railway properties from a threatened bankruptcy that, besides injuriously affecting all business enterprises, would inevitably bring ruin to thousands of innocent children and defenceless women—whose small investments in railway stocks and bonds were made largely because of the reasonable belief that the Government would not legislate so as to destroy or seriously cripple an industry created by private means to perform a necessary public service—does not justify the violation of a statute that forbids acts which, independent of legislation, involve no element of turpitude. Yet, upon the other hand, justice to those who were active in supporting those portions of the law which have resulted in preventing the railways from mitigating by agreement the force of competition for traffic, demands that we shall presume this effect to have been undesired and unanticipated.

Experience has demonstrated that the prohibition of pooling tends not only to deprive the railways of sufficient revenue to pay fair wages and reasonable dividends and interest, but also to foster unjust discriminations between competing localities and shippers, and to impose upon the entire public the permanent burden of meeting, by charges higher than those necessary under better conditions, the wasteful expenses incurred to maintain a competition that is effective at a few points only, and often for but few shippers, that is at once the prolific parent and devoted slave of trusts and combinations, and is beneficial to no one except the soliciting agent, the ticket scalper, the parasite.

The word "competition" is not correctly applied to the business of moving persons and property by rail, and, when suggested as having regulative value and importance, is deceitful, dangerous, and vicious; for however closely one line parallels another there are always many stations that are wholly dependent upon the facilities afforded by a single road, and no matter how actively the rival carriers struggle for supremacy at adjacent "competitive" points such local stations will remain at the mercy of a monopoly whose desire for gain is not diminished by losses sustained elsewhere. Not infrequently this pseudo-competition is for the traffic in a single important commodity, as grain, lumber, live stock, dressed meats, salt, or sugar; and the reduced rates, often secret, upon this commodity destroy, so long as they continue, the relative adjustment of charges and produce unjust dis-

criminations against competing commodities which may materially and sometimes irretrievably injure those dealing in them. There have also been notorious instances of rates lowered to secure competitive traffic that have been accorded only to a single shipper of a particular commodity, thus excluding and discriminating against all other shippers and articles of traffic

Unification of interest is the alternative to competition. This does not require the actual merging of all railway corporations in a single organization, though it may finally appear that the most satisfactory results are attainable only in that way. The most practicable step in advance at present is the consolidation of railway interests, through legalized agreements, providing for the division of competitive traffic, made enforceable between the parties thereto and operating under the constant supervision of public authorities, acting not only in the interest of passengers and shippers but of the whole people, including those who own and operate railways. Contracts of this nature, popularly called "pooling" agreements, became common in this country during the years from 1870 to 1887 when the passage of the interstate commerce law made their discontinuance necessary. Though there were conflicting opinions, they were generally regarded as contrary to the policy of the common law and consequently not enforceable by judicial process, their observance depending wholly upon the good faith of the parties. As railway managers were so far impressed with the correctness of this view that they seldom, if ever, ventured to appeal to the courts for the enforcement of such contracts, it is practically correct to affirm that the legally recognized right to pool traffic or earnings has never existed in the United States, and therefore the proposition to permit and make them enforceable by the courts is one to endow railway corporations with a power never possessed by them in this country, a power to act in a manner expressly prohibited by comparatively recent legislation, and to invoke the aid of the United States courts in the enforcement of a class of contracts which from the foundation of the government has been regarded as opposed to public policy.

But the statement of the radical nature of the proposed legislation or the extent of its divergence from precedents, though frequently forced to serve in that capacity, is not an argument against it, but, on the contrary, imposes the duty of carefully scrutinizing the evidence upon both sides and of promptly acting in accordance with reason and justice. Those against it are uniformly vague, indefinite, or mendacious, and, in their most popular form, consist of statements of the vast capital, the large annual aggregate earnings, and the important public services performed by the railway system.

To those who advance these arguments it has apparently never occurred that the magnitude of the business and the importance of the services performed is a most cogent reason for bringing the railway system out of a state of chaotic internal warfare to a condition of compact, homogeneous autonomy. Nearly all of the difficulty attending satisfactory railway regulation arises from the existence of the former condition, which is also responsible for all unjust discriminations and the cause of many wasteful expenditures that result in exorbitant charges or bankruptcy. As ninety-five per cent. of all railway stations must, under any circumstances, be dependent upon a single line, and any desire to exact high rates is undoubtedly strengthened by losses at competitive points, it seems undeniable that the abolition of competition at the relatively few points where it now exists

would reduce rather than increase the chance of any one being charged exorbitant rates.

The arguments favoring the unification of railway interests, and of legalized and properly regulated "pooling" as a long step toward that result, are generally allowed to rest upon the abolition of the unjust discriminations resulting from competition, but this is by no means the total good that would be accomplished. Such unification would certainly result in doing away with those extravagant features of present railway methods that are now kept up because their continuance, however costly, seems the sole alternative to greater losses through the diversion of traffic to competing lines. Any agreement for the division of traffic would necessarily include the discontinuance of the costly practice of paying commissions to secure the ticketing of passengers and shipment of freight over particular lines. This practice now costs many millions annually, which accrue, not to the benefit of travellers and shippers, but to that of middlemen, or, in other cases, become the cover for rebates and unjust discriminations. With traffic divided upon a basis independent of the amounts secured by the agents of particular lines, the absurdity of maintaining separate agencies for soliciting and receiving it would be patent. Joint agencies affording the public more satisfactory service would speedily be substituted for those of individual lines, with a considerable reduction in their total number and aggregate cost. Where one of two or more lines carrying traffic between the same points operates a route that is longer, has steeper grades or for any other reason, is more expensive, attention would soon be directed to the possibility of economy through sending all traffic over the cheapest route. The extent of the saving that might be effected in this direction is incalculable. Great loss to the railways, and indirectly to their patrons, results from the impossibility under present methods of utilizing cars and locomotives to anything like their full capacity, and the consequent necessity of a much larger investment in rolling stock than would be required under better conditions. The average service actually performed during the year ending June 30, 1894, by each of the 1,205,169 freight cars which cost the railways of the United States approximately $500,000,000, was equal to carrying a full load less than 4,500 miles, or to working up to full capacity but little over twelve days. It is scarcely consonant with the business sagacity correctly attributed to railway managers to believe that under conditions that would permit it they would not speedily secure better returns from the capital invested in equipment. Nothing is more annoying to shippers than the difficulty attending efforts to ascertain through rates on long distance shipments; and this, together with the conflicting rules and regulations in regard to traffic, established by railways in different sections of the country, constitutes a serious hindrance to the profitable interchange of the surplus products of distant regions. The convenience of railway managers as well as their perception of the desirability of easily understood and definite schedules of rates and plain, unambiguous rules of shipment would result in speedy simplification of rate schedules, rules, and classifications, and in a progressive movement toward ultimate absolute uniformity over the entire country, if the unreasonable jealousies and unnatural rivalries, that are the causes of the present conflict, were removed.

The foregoing are the principal advantages which will accrue to the public as a result of legislation removing the ban from agreements for the apportionment of traffic or earnings among competing lines. This change

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXVII.

AUGUST, 1896.

THE FUTURE OF THE ANGLO-SAXON RACE.

BY SIR WALTER BESANT.

THE future of the English-speaking peoples is a subject which at this present moment seems of more than ordinary importance, because there are signs of very serious dangers which threaten that future, of possibilities which may most disastrously affect the fortunes of the Anglo-Saxon race. What it is that is now in the possession of that race either to administer wisely or to throw away; what a magnificent heritage it has obtained either to develop or to ruin; what power and empire and authority and greatness unequalled in the history of mankind it may achieve or may destroy; what it actually has and holds in the present: these are the things to which I propose to direct the attention of my readers.

The ancestors of the Anglo-Saxon race came from a cold, sterile, and ungenial tract of country in the midst of which now stands the very noble city of Hamburg. They came over in hordes; they settled down on the English coasts; whole districts of their native land were deserted; they came in tribes and in families; wherever they sat down they brought with them, as part of themselves, not to be changed, their laws and their customs and their language. These survived, and remain to this day in essentials the language, the laws, the customs, of their country. Observe, then, the first obvious facts about

Copyright, 1896, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

this people. In their own homes they become restless; they cannot remain quiet in their own settlements; they are impelled to change. They cross the water, carrying with them their language, their religion, their institutions. It is now acknowledged by all writers that they did not exterminate the Britons, who continued after the struggle was over to live among their conquerors. But the Saxons absorbed them: the conquerors took nothing from the Britons, whose religion (they were Christians), whose manners (they were highly civilized), whose laws (they were Roman), the Saxons trampled under foot. Not a vestige remains of the ancient British civilization. The masterful Anglo-Saxon would keep his own laws, his own customs, his own religion. When the Danes came the same thing happened. A few years after the struggle we find that the Danes are absorbed; everything is again English. When the Normans came the same thing is observed; after a few years everything is once more English. All that the Normans imposed was the Feudal system, out of which the English have been gradually struggling for eight hundred years. The point which I wish the reader to remember is that, wherever he goes, the Anglo-Saxon carries with him a great load of personal property—laws, religion, manners, customs, and language—which he will not exchange or part with. Wherever he goes he is not absorbed—he absorbs. He continues to do this in the present day just as of old he absorbed, one after the other, Briton, Dane, and Norman. In England we are still perpetually absorbing this stream of foreign immigration which never ceases—German, Norwegian, French, Italian. The United States of America in the same way cover ground which has been Spanish, French, Dutch, and Swedish. What trace can you find of the Spanish occupation?—an ancient town. What trace do you find of the Dutch?—a few houses here and there which remind one of Amsterdam. Anglo-Saxon America is constantly engaged in absorbing. Immigrants by thousands pour every year upon the American shores from all quarters of the globe. They land: they scatter over the country: in a few years, like those who are American born, they bear the stamp of the English law and speak the English language.

We are, then, as we always have been, a masterful race; we are a stiff-necked, unyielding race; a tenacious race; we are a race which cannot change its own mind—as regards laws and

manners—for the mind of any other race; we are a people which if it settles down anywhere, means to go on living as before and to make other people live in the same way.

These are very marked and very important qualities. Had any one observed these qualities when the Saxon ships first wintered on the Isle of Thanet, he might have prophesied a great and solid future for this people; but no prophet at any time, I am convinced, would ever have prophesied a future so great, so solid, so glorious, as the race has achieved; while as to what lies before it, although the possibilities are so clear that a child could read them, we have been somehow afraid of speaking out.

In the next place observe another racial mark. The Anglo-Saxons have always, like their ancestors, been a restless people. To sit down in the same place cultivating the soil for generation after generation has always been impossible for them. From time to time they want change; they are always wanting change. During a thousand years and more they found that change in continual war. When one reads in history page after page of war—war—war—battle—victory—defeat—the slaughter of thousands, the towns given over to pillage, the burning farms, the starving children; when, as one reads the very letters grow blood-red, and the very sunshine grows blood red; and the very floor grows red with the blood of the killed and wounded, one must remember that the things which seem so terrible to us were not in the least terrible to them. They were only part of life. The people carried on war between themselves without ceasing; the King of Northumbria fought the King of Mercia; the King of Wessex carried war into the realm of the King of Kent; it was not because the Mercians hated the Northumbrians—it was because of the instinct for change; because the restlessness of the people made war necessary.

I maintain, therefore, that restlessness is as much a mark of the Anglo-Saxon as masterfulness and obstinacy. I think that the rebellions, the risings, the civil wars of English history were due more to restlessness in the blood than to loyalty to this cause or that. What was Wat Tyler's rebellion but an instinctive restless upheaval of the people? They listened to leaders who formulated grievances, and held out hopes of wonderful things; they rose all together seized by the strange contagion which sometimes

runs among people like wildfire ; they rejoiced, those rude and ignorant peasants, in freedom from labor and the prospect of fighting and of plunder. It was a brief but glorious holiday that they enjoyed. Those who escaped and got safely home had much to think about and much to tell. But their restlessness was subdued for the time. It seems to us, considering history, most wonderful that so many men were always ready to flock after this or that standard. How could they be persuaded to risk their lives ? Because they were restless ; the village life was monotonous ; the daily labor was wearisome. So, when the chance came, they seized a pike and marched with the column of shouting rustics—not in loyalty to the Red Rose or the White, but because they wanted a change.

There was another way in which they showed their restlessness. One cannot, unfortunately, be always fighting ; there must be intervals, sometimes long intervals, of peace. What, then, was the poor man to do when his eyes turned with yearning beyond the blue hills, and when his cottage and his fields became loathsome to him ; when, in short, the old restlessness got into his veins and he could no longer contain himself ? He could go on pilgrimage. That was the safety valve. When the restless fit grew so strong that it could not be repressed, the man begged a license of the bishop and with staff in hand set off on his pilgrimage. The roads were black with the multitudes of those who trudged or rode on pilgrimage to our Lady of Walsingham or St. Thomas of Canterbury. We must remember the dulness of the country life, where nothing happened but the change of seasons. We must remember, also, the animation and business of the highway along which the pilgrims walked ; the night spent in some monastic house, the gay and animated conversation of the company, the feasting and the music and the singing—what an exchange was that from the lonely cottage and the quiet farm !

The Anglo-Saxon race is thus, essentially and above all, a restless race. What has this restlessness done for the race in modern times ? Look at America ; look at India ; look at South Africa ; look at Australia ; look at New Zealand. They are monuments—I hope lasting monuments—to the Anglo-Saxon restlessness. Consider the history of the sixteenth century when that restlessness sent out ships by the hundred for the exploration of the American coast, and the capture of the Spanish ships ;

consider that of the next century when the American Colonies were founded; consider that of the last century when, with the help of the Colonists, the English turned out the French from America; and when, without any help, they turned them out of India. Consider the growth of English trade; the despatch of ships to every port in the world; the increase of English wealth by leaps and bounds even at a time when England was carrying on a death struggle in Continental war. What do all these things mean? Enterprise? Courage? Tenacity? Yes; all these things; and, what is more, the racial restlessness which cannot remain still or contented.

Every year there are carried away from the shores of Great Britain so many hundred thousand of our young men. They are the restless class: most of them have proved themselves totally unable to accept the conditions of modern life; they hate the desk; they hate books; they cannot pass examinations. For these young men, who in other respects are often the very flower of the flock, there are places where they can live without books. Formerly there were openings for them in the United States, in Australia, in New Zealand. Those openings seem to be closed; the stream of emigration turns in other directions. There is now, for instance, South Africa. Now, just exactly what England was formerly to the Angle or the Jute in the German court, so is such a new country as South Africa to his descendant of the present day—the land of enterprise, the land of wealth, the land of fighting, the land of possibilities. There are other places. British Columbia is not yet filled up; Canada, Western Australia, Tasmania, could support a tenfold present population. That is not, however, the question. I want to point out the continuity of history. Things repeat themselves because we are the descendants of our ancestors. The Frisian came over and settled in England fifteen hundred years ago; he made the place his own; he imposed his laws, his customs, his religion, and told the Britons to become absorbed or to disappear. It is discovered that our young brother does just exactly the same thing. He is in America; he is in Australia; he must move on; he must make for himself a new nest; he must fight for it if necessary. And when he has settled, he must rule; he will tolerate no master.

Now let us consider at the close of the nineteenth century what part of the world belongs to our race. We have the whole of North

America, an immense possession, glorious in the present, destined to become far more glorious in the future; we have the whole of Australia; the whole of India; the whole of New Zealand; we have rich and beautiful islands, such as Jamaica, Ceylon, Newfoundland, Mauritius, and hundreds of other islands; we have Burmah, Singapore, and the settlements of the far East; we have a vast extent of territory in Africa; we have strongholds in the Mediterranean; we occupy Egypt; the whole round world is dotted here and covered there with the possessions of the Anglo-Saxon race; all that is best, most temperate, most fertile, best fitted for the white man's permanent residence, is ours: if it were one United Federation of States it would be the greatest, the richest, the most powerful empire, republic or state that history has ever recorded.

The imagination cannot all at once take in the magnitude of the Anglo-Saxon possessions. We want help to assist us in understanding what our possessions really mean. Take the test of the language, for instance. If we add up all together the numbers of those who speak the European languages we should find that one-third of the whole number speak our language, while only one-eighth speak French, and only one-seventh speak German. For at this moment there are a hundred and twenty millions of people who speak English as their native tongue, without counting the Hindoos, who are fast acquiring it.

Take, again, the test of literature. Everybody now reads. Some, it is true, read only newspapers: most read books. There are free public libraries, which put all books worth reading into the hands of the people. Suppose that only one-half of the English-speaking race read books; that means that a popular work, a work which appeals to the heart or to the head of the great public, can command sixty millions of readers, and in the immediate future will command double, and, presently, treble that number. Never before, in the history of the whole world, has literature commanded so enormous an audience; never before has poet, dramatist, novelist, historian, preacher, had so magnificent a theatre, so crowded a house. We cannot realize such a theatre; we can only in imagination see a vast theatre filled with white faces, listening faces, faces that are played upon by passing sunshine and flying cloud, as the speaker moves their hearts. Perhaps we may imagine something of this vast audience, if we

remember that it used to be thought much if a book was read by two or three thousand, and now we can talk of a book being read by sixty million.

It surprises, again, one who considers this present position of our race not so much that we have spread over so vast an area, and have multiplied ourselves so enormously, but that this has been done with such wonderful rapidity. In the sixteenth century, when the English-speaking race was just beginning to feel its way across the Atlantic, it did not number more than five millions. A hundred years ago, when England began her long war with France, her own population was no more than fifteen millions, while in America there were about five millions—twenty millions in all. Again, a hundred years ago there were in the whole of Australia no more than a few thousand convicts and guards; in New Zealand, Tasmania, and South Africa there were none. In fifty years we have seen these countries assume a population as a man puts on a cloak. We look one moment; there is the solitude of the forest, the lapping of the river on its shores, the cry of the wild beast. In twenty years' time there is a great city in the midst of a crowded colony. Nor are these ephemeral cities; they have come to stay; they stand in the centres of real and lasting trade; they increase every year as the country to which they belong grows richer and more populous. In America the States which a hundred years ago were the far West, belonging to the fierce and untameable Red Indian, are now central States, while the far West is the coast of the Pacific, and the Red Indian has almost disappeared; the prairies are broken up into farms; the woods are disappearing before the axe of the settler, and the States which thirty years ago were wild lands are now filling up with towns and villages and cultivated farms.

I have spoken of a hundred years ago: one may say fifty years ago.

It was then that a mysterious restlessness seized all of us at the same time. English, Scotch, Irish, Welsh in thousands sailed to Australia, to New Zealand, to Canada; some of them flocked to the United States. The young men of the States moved westward with one consent. The Irish seem more than any to have felt the impulse, and they sent half their people across the seas. We used to say that the Irish exodus was the result of the

potato famine. That was one cause, but not the greatest: it was restlessness that fired the blood of a people who had lived too long in peace and quiet. It is now, as it always has been with our race; from time to time we want something to work off the instinctive restlessness. Travel, emigration, the struggle with savage races, the many little wars which are always stirring our blood—these things take the place of those which formerly quieted our restless souls.

Mere emigration, however, will not account for this vast increase of the English-speaking population. Besides, the increase has gone on in England as well: we who a hundred years ago were fifteen millions are now forty millions. The increase has been brought about partly by the invasion of the foreign element which the Anglo-Saxon has made haste to absorb. Look at shop windows as you walk about certain parts of London; the foreign names occur continually—here are French, Dutch, German, Italian, and Norwegian names. Inside every house you would find an Englishman bearing that name. It is exactly the same in New York. The Anglo-Saxon has absorbed that man; in the second generation he is pure English or American.

There remains, however, the remarkable fact that in a hundred years the English-speaking race has leaped up from twenty millions to a hundred and twenty millions, and has extended its possessions by something like a fifth part of the habitable globe. It would be impossible to find any other example in history of an increase so rapid, and an extension of territory so vast.

This, then, is the present position of our race: we possess the finest and most desirable parts of the earth; we are more wealthy than all the rest of the world put together; we are connected together by a common ancestry; by a common history up to a certain point; by the same laws which we have inherited from our common ancestors; by the same speech; by the same religion, not speaking of sects; by the same literature; by the same customs, with minute differences; and by millions of close ties of blood relationship, even those of brothers, sisters, parents, and children. It would be difficult to find stronger bonds: they are such as nothing in the world can cut asunder. No fighting between ourselves, not centuries of warfare, not rivers of blood, can destroy these bonds. Nations which are so connected may have their quarrels, their wars, intensified by kinship into civil wars;

but they cannot cut asunder these bonds, which bind them more tightly than any treaty, or alliance, or covenanted bond of union.

Yet, to speak of the present union of the English-speaking race is ridiculous. What, then, about our disunion? Well, we form, theoretically, one great empire and one great republic. In point of population the two sections of our race are equal; but one section is split up and divided into many parts; the other is an undivided whole, which adds very greatly to its strength. Again, one section, itself the union of many sovereign States, is bound together by a central government representative of all those States. And it has free trade between all those States. The other section has a central government, but it is not representative of other component parts; each of these parts—each of these sovereign states—has its own government, and is practically independent and sovereign, though it is called a colony; there is no free trade among these states; but each has a tariff of her own to suit the supposed wants of her people. In other words, the tie which binds Great Britain and Ireland to Canada is so slight as to be little more than a sentiment; so with Australia. England derives no revenue from the colonies; yet it is understood that in case of war she must defend these colonies out of her own resources. And slight as is the connection of Great Britain with one of these states, their connection with each other is slighter still: there is hardly even a touch of sentiment, as yet discovered, in the regard of Australia for Canada.

The position, therefore, is this. On the one hand, there are the United States, really, not nominally, united—a compact extent of territory, with a constitution which makes it very unlikely, very difficult, for any questions to arise which will endanger that union, with a population equal to one-half the whole of our numbers; on the other hand, we have a so-called empire consisting of the British islands and the practically sovereign states of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and India, without speaking of the smaller and less important dependencies. The advantage, so far as to position and strength, would seem to be with America; at the same time this advantage is every year lessened, because population always increases faster in new than in old countries. If in fifty years' time the United States will have a hundred millions instead of sixty, Australia

will have twenty millions instead of four, South Africa ten millions instead of two, and so on. Let us remember that the continent of Australia will be able to support a population of two hundred millions, and that South Africa will support as many as are likely to demand its hospitality for a hundred years to come.

There are three things which separate states—difference of language, difference of religion, difference in form of government. With us there is no difference in language, nor is there, practically, any difference in religion. The vast majority of English-speaking people profess some form of the Protestant religion; those who do not, enjoy the most perfect freedom to follow their conscience. The third point, however, the difference in form of government, is serious.

I suppose that many have never realized the significance of the fact, or even the fact itself, that while all the states that have come out of Great Britain have had to create their own form of government, every one has become practically a republic. In every one of them exist all those institutions which are essentially republican—the recognition of every man's equal rights, the vote given to every man, representative government, no hereditary or privileged class, no established church, free education. The governor, who is the only officer sent out by the mother country, represents the President of the state, who is nominally the Queen of the colony; but as President he has very little power: all the power is in the hands of the people and their representatives. What does this mean? All these countries found themselves under the necessity of creating a form of government for themselves. Did they proceed to copy the form of the mother country? Not at all. Did they weigh the advantages against the disadvantages of monarchic or republican government? Not at all. Quietly, without any fuss or argument, without exciting any bad blood or party feeling, they proceeded, each state by itself, and without communication or conspiracy or mutual understanding, to create a new republic.

This is a very remarkable circumstance in the history of the English colonies: it is very significant that not one should have attempted to produce a copy of the British Constitution. Here, in England, we grow up contentedly with our King, Lords, Commons, and Church; many among us are prepared to defend our institutions *en bloc;* many more, who would not trouble to

defend things as they are, regard them as institutions which it would be disastrous to change on account of the bad blood which revolution would cause; others feel that our own institutions are more comfortable than those of a republic, because they require less personal effort on the part of the individual; very few of us at the present moment are really and actively revolutionary; yet, when these people go away and make a new country for themselves, not one has ever proposed that their new constitution shall be copied from the old.

We have thus seen the beginnings, the development, and the present position of the Anglo-Saxon race. There are six great countries, of which two are fully grown, and four, viz., Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand, are practically only in their infancy. We are united by such bonds as I have mentioned; we are disunited, except for sentiment, only by differences in the form of government. As for the seas which roll between us, they are no longer an element of disunion; we are parted by two or three weeks; we pass over to each other without difficulty, almost without danger.

Let us now consider the possible future of our race. What will be the development of the British colonies, for instance, in the matter of government? Will they put off the republican, and assume the monarchical form? I cannot conceive such a change as even possible. I cannot understand that any republican, any man in whom personal equality is part of his very soul, not to be torn out except with his life, could ever desire the election of a king, whose very name means to him hereditary rule, hereditary privilege, hereditary superiority.

With every generation the republican ideas certainly become intensified; with every generation, then, these great colonies will become more and more separated from the mother country in feeling. There is one event, and only one, which would be able to convert a republic into a monarchy; that would be a life and death struggle, a disastrous war, a term of deep-seated national humiliation, when the country might take shelter under a dictator who might become emperor or king.

What, however, about England? Shall she change her forms in order to fall in line with the other Anglo-Saxon countries? In asking such a question I would not look for a reply to the books and papers and arguments of philosophers. We must

not ask what is philosophically considered best or fittest; we must go straight to the people themselves, and ascertain in which direction their thoughts are tending, whether in the direction of change or in the direction of conservatism. How are we to find out what they think? We must read the papers which they read; we must listen to the orators and preachers who have found a way to make them listen, and have touched their hearts. When I was a boy I was curious about journals and papers of all sorts. I used to buy, especially, certain papers designed for the working classes. My earliest recollection of politics is that the Queen, the Church, the House of Lords, the capitalists, and all employers of labor were every week attacked with a venom and a virulence which exceeded everything that we could now show. All these institutions were to be pulled down—the day after to-morrow. Now, although such papers as these were exceptional and extreme, the smoke showed the existence of fire; there was a great deal of loose, vague, fierce republicanism in the air; not only working-men, but sober, educated, thinking men were asking whether the time was not come for a republic. The question was not whether a republic is or is not a better form of government than a limited monarchy, but whether the time was come for a republic—which begged the other question, and practically assumed that a republic is the better form. Now I do not suppose that the number of philosophers who would like a republic on abstract principles is less than it was, but I am quite sure that the number of people generally who ardently desire such a change of government in Great Britain is far less in proportion to the population, while the scurrilous and blackguard papers have, so far as I know, entirely disappeared. I lay great stress on this point, because there is, if we come to think of it, this very remarkable relation of the press to the people that one cannot say whether the press leads the people or whether the people leads the press.

Returning to possible changes in England, I think it may be assumed as a matter of general experience that the duty of preserving our institutions, with such modifications as may be necessary from time to time, is at this moment a fixed conviction with the great majority of the English people. Loyalty to the Crown, which has been cultivated, so to speak, by the long reign of a blameless sovereign, is deeper

and truer and established on stronger foundations than ever it has been before, even in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; the Church is no longer reviled and hated by the people; even those who would deprive the Church of her national character regard her with respect, and as regards the House of Lords we hear very little now about the foolishness of believing in hereditary wisdom. The form of government under which the English people live is so firmly established, it rests on such solid foundations of the will, consent, and deliberate choice of the people, that it will not be removed or changed till something happens to change this will and consent. Nor do I think that there will be in the great colonies any approach to English ideas in this respect.

The colonies could not, in fact, adopt the British constitution. The English form of limited sovereignty has grown up slowly and gradually; the people have forgotten the long struggle of centuries by which they did limit at last the power of the Sovereign; the memory of that struggle has departed; it seems as if the thing grew without any struggle; within the memory of living men there has been no revival of the old struggle; it seems a natural thing that the Sovereign should not be able to command anything except the affection and the respect of her people.

If, however, the English government remains what it is, and the English colonies become more and more obstinately republican, there will most certainly exist a permanent cleavage between them, growing every year wider and wider. That is true, and it is a danger which can only be met in one way, which I will presently explain.

Apart from the form of government, what line of change awaits our race in the immediate future? The colonies will drop off one after the other, and become independent. Australia, which could not, as yet, defend herself against Japan, must, as she grows stronger, become independent. We shall then—say in fifty years—see six great English-speaking nations; every one will be more populous than France at the present day; filled with people who have absorbed all foreign admixtures; governed by the same laws; inheriting all the Anglo-Saxon qualities, virtues, and weaknesses.

The people of these nations will be unlike each other in peculiarities, due to climate; those of tropical Queensland, for instance, will differ in certain respects from the inhabitants of To-

ronto or Quebec. But in mind and in manners they will be all alike.

What will happen in a world which possesses six great nations all united by such bonds as we have already described?

We stand already at the parting of the ways. By our actions, by our words, of this very time we may affect for good or for evil the whole future of our race.

There are two roads lying before us; two roads well marked —visible for many miles; one road as easy as the other. Which shall we take?

The one road leads through wars, which must be civil wars for ferocity, for massacres, for prolonged rage, for the bitterness which lasts for generations; for the evil example which leads to other wars; for the ruin and the waste and the destruction of all that the Anglo-Saxon race was sent into the world to achieve. Here is an imaginary page of history: "After the termination of the long and disastrous war between Great Britain and the United States, in which so many fleets were destroyed with practically all the trained sailors on both sides, and when both countries were exhausted, the Dominion of Canada declared war against the Australian Federation, and another sea war was commenced which lasted five years . . . " and so on. "Between one state and another there were commercial rivalries, protective and prohibitive tariffs; the bitterness of old quarrels; a constant readiness to rush into new quarrels; the Anglo-Saxon race, of which so much had once been expected and prophesied, fell during these centuries into a family at enmity with itself; always at war one with another," and so on. Is this kind of thing possible? It is more than possible; it is quite probable. When brothers begin to fight, they never cease fighting; they can never be reconciled; and each battle only makes the former hatred worse. Therefore, for these English-speaking nations we must make war impossible; and since at present four of these nations have not yet become independent, we must make war impossible between the two which represent them all. The late scare, from which we are not yet quite free, has shown us some of the dangers that lie in our way; one word more of arrogance or insolence from one side or the other, and we should have been plunged into such a war as would serve for an example for these younger nations; nay, they would themselves have been dragged

into the struggle, and so the seeds of hatred would have been sown in their hearts, too, to bear harvest in the years to come.

We must make it impossible for any war at any time to happen between these nations. How can we do this? It will not be sufficient to trust to the good sense, the moderation, the wisdom of leaders and ministers. All the wisdom in the world will not avail against personal ambition.

There is another danger. We talked at the outset of the restlessness of our race. This restlessness in modern life is generally cured by travel, by the struggle for wealth, by intellectual effort; but there is a great mass of the people who do not travel, are not engrossed in work, do not work with the brain. The danger of a simultaneous movement, an unanimous cry for war, such a rush as that of Wat Tyler' s men, is one ever present and much greater in a republic than in a monarchy. We must guard against the ambition of statesmen and against the madness of the people. For my own part I can see no way open to us except a Court of Arbitration, before which all cases of difference shall be brought. The mere existence of such a Board will prevent cases from arising, while the knowledge that there can never be war between the two nations will at once alter the tone of the press in every Anglo-Saxon country to that of permanent alliance.

Now suppose such a Board of Arbitration to be established. What do we see in the future? The six nations will be separate, yet united; each will be free to work out its own development in its own way; it will be impossible for them to quarrel; they will understand that free trade between themselves will be the best in their own interests; their press will be courteous, each to each; they will be rivals only in art, science, and literature. Above all, they will form a firm alliance, offensive and defensive, with such a navy that all the world united in arms would be powerless against them. And, as an example for all the world to see, there will be the great federation of our race, an immense federation, free, law-abiding, peaceful, yet ready to fight; tenacious of old customs; dwelling continually with the same ideas; keeping, as their ancestors from Friesland did before them, each family as the unit; every home the centre of the earth; every township of a dozen men the centre of the government.

WALTER BESANT.

IS JAPANESE COMPETITION A MYTH?

BY THE HON. ROBERT P. PORTER.

WHAT is Japanese progress and Japanese competition? You hear the question asked on all sides since the war with China, and the answers take as wide a range as the accounts of eyewitnesses of the battles and sieges of the conflict itself. Some say there is nothing in Japanese competition; that it is but a new bogie of the American Protectionist, stuffed with straw on the Pacific Coast, and carried eastward to terrify the American artisan, and induce him to come into line for the Republican ticket next fall. There are others who say that this Japanese, or, rather Asiatic, competition scare has its origin in London; that it was set agoing there by the Manchester bimetallists, who believe the cotton mills of India, of China, and of Japan are going to rob England of 400,000,000 Asiatic customers for its cotton yarns and cotton cloth; that the object of the scare is to induce the British government to adopt a more liberal policy on the silver question, and thereby take away the protection which these silver-using countries practically have against the gold-standard countries of Europe.

There are yet others who, having no definite facts to guide them, have reserved all opinions on the subject until inquiry into existing facts can be made and the truth established. In the United States little attention has been given the question except by representatives of branches of business that have suddenly been confronted with a competition from Japan that has thrown all calculations to the winds and for the moment paralyzed prosperous industry. So far these incidents have been confined, as I shall show, to the textile trades and to some special manufactures, such as floor matting, hempen and jute rugs, umbrellas, matches, brushes, especially tooth-brushes, some lines of porcelain and

earthenware, straw plaits and braids, paper of various kinds, and other miscellaneous articles. It is not so much the quantities of these articles exported to the United States that has given alarm, but the sudden manner in which the Japanese have, metaphorically speaking, thrown their hats into the American market, and challenged our labor and capital with goods which, for excellence and cheapness, seem for the moment to defy competition, even with the latest labor-saving appliances at hand.

Those who have any doubt as to the reality of Japanese competition should glance at the windows of our leading carpet and upholstery establishments. There they will find, during these summer months, large quantities and infinite variety of cool-looking mattings and blue and white cotton rugs from Japan. A reference to the advertising columns of newspapers in the leading cities shows that these goods have been the specialties of the season and have been sold in enormous quantities. During this same season, whole windows in our popular drygoods houses have been devoted to most attractive Japanese cotton crapes, in colors as delicate as rainbow hues, at ten and twelve cents per yard. The silk departments of the same stores exhibit a tempting array of their summer silks, or *habutai*, as it is called in Japan, at such phenomenally low prices that the American silk manufacturer is pushed out of the market. In the early days of missionary work, the good Mrs. Jellybys used to hem moral pocket handkerchiefs for the little heathen. To-day the heathen Japanese have turned the tables on the Christian nations and cornered the world's market for silk handkerchiefs, exporting within the last few years 100,000,000 of these useful articles. Look at that big pile of tooth-brushes in the window of the corner drug store. Sometimes they are sold for ten cents each, sometimes given away with a twenty-five cent box of toothpowder. These brushes are made in Japan. An Osaka firm offered me the product of their factories for $1.50 (gold) per gross. At this price some of our enterprising metropolitan newspapers will soon be offering a brand-new tooth-brush free with every copy of their morning journals. Five dollars gold will purchase a gross of hair-brushes, and I obtained samples of an infinite variety of nail-brushes and shaving-brushes at prices equally low. It may be urged that the quality of these cheap goods is poor. That is true, but the Japanese, while making at this price, are also

making at $8 gold per gross a superior grade of tooth-brush for which we pay forty and fifty cents apiece at a fashionable drug store.

But what of all this? Suppose we admit the facts, the articles mentioned are small, and the total not so very large when compared with our total importations from abroad. To be sure, the articles are comparatively unimportant, but they are staple. Matches are a small article, but last year Japan exported, mostly to China, nearly five million dollars' worth, and this year her export of this small article will probably exceed that figure. Their safety matches can be bought for fourteen silver dollars, or, say, $7.50 gold for 7,200 boxes. Can Sweden compete at this price? Can the United States? It is doubtful.

Viewed as a whole, the foreign trade of Japan is not inconsequential. An increase of $30,000,000 of commerce in 1895 over 1894 is no small item for a country like Japan. The total exports and imports, including bullion, reached $296,000,000 in silver in 1895, and will exceed those figures this year. That we may know the exact bearing of this increased trade on American manufactures and labor, I have prepared a table giving the increase in the export of certain commodities from Japan between 1885 and 1895. It may be studied with profit by those interested, for it tells the story just as it is, and when that is done, the reader may arrive at his own conclusion:

TOTAL COMMERCE OF JAPAN, 1885 AND 1895.

Total exports and imports, 1895	$296,000,000
" " " " 1885	77,300,000
Increase	$218,700,000

This would seem to be a fairly gratifying increase—about threefold.

In the following table I have endeavored to group some of the more striking individual increases in the export trade of Japan for the period under discussion:

	1885.	1895.
	Value in Silver Dollars.	
Export of textiles of all kinds	$511,990	$22,177,626
Raw silk	14,473,396	50,928,440
Grains and provisions	4,514,843	12,723,771
Metal goods	2,112,997	6,538,220
Drugs, including sulphur and camphor	1,089,513	3,078,357
Books and paper	150,032	488,358
Tea	6,854,120	8,879,242
Matches	60,565	4,672,861
Straw braids	(no record of any)	1,387,643
Matting	935	3,461,369
Umbrellas (European)	1,765	735,207
Porcelain curios and sundries	2,786,876	11,624,701

Within the last few months I have visited the districts in Japan and inspected the industries reported in the above table. The increase in the exports of textiles, which was over forty-fold in ten years, is due to the fact that Japan is a nation of weavers. The returns of 1895 show over one million weavers. Women weave in Japan as women sew with us. It is no exaggeration to say that in nearly every house in rural Japan the spinning wheel and loom are kept going from morning till night. It is impossible to gauge the capacity of these people in this industry by the present production. In some of the silk districts, I found modern machinery and even regularly equipped mills, employing from five hundred to a thousand hands.. As a rule, the factories range from 40 to 120 hands, with the products of thousands of houses with single looms to draw from for the demand. In Fukui, the most important exporting district, the greater part of the weaving is done in the homes, though the establishment of finishing houses makes it possible for the weaver to secure a uniformity of finish that the old method precluded. The exports of all grades of silk goods from Japan will be largely increased in the next decade, and this fact has been recognized by the French, who propose to put a duty on Japanese *habutai*. Nor will the conflict be confined to *habutai* alone, for the Japanese are awake to the fact that France leads the world in the originality and beauty of her textile designs. They have in the Kyoto district reproduced her moire antique with success The splendid silk stuff they are making for furniture covering may be seen in the brilliant effects of the French renaissance.

The Japanese are making every preparation, by the formation of guilds and associations, to improve the quality and increase the uniformity of their goods. It is well to note in this connection that while Japan has stimulated its exports of the manufactured article, it has enormously increased the production and export of raw silk. This has been done by the introduction of new methods and a more scientific treatment of the silkworm and the filature. I visited in Japan filature establishments equal to any I saw in France ten years ago when investigating the silk industry of that country. In the Fukui district the first silk *habutai* was manufactured in 1888, an aggregation of about $50,000. Last year this district produced $6,076,220 worth, and the present year, I am told, the output will be still larger.

In the spinning of cotton and the manufacture of cotton cloth, a still more phenomenal progress is noted, though not shown in the above table. The export of cotton cloth from Japan probably does not exceed $5,000,000, but it supplies a large and increasing home demand. Last year the value of the silk and cotton cloth produced in Japan, including such important articles as kimono stuff and obi fabric, was $71,350,747. Cotton spinning in 1889 gave employment to only 5,394 women and 2,539 men. In 1895, over 30,000 women and 10,000 men were employed in mills that for equipment and output are equal to those of any country. The future *situs* of the cotton industry, at least to supply the Asiatic trade, is bound to be in China and Japan. England is doomed so far as this trade is concerned and nothing can save her—not even bimetallism, as some imagine. Cotton mills are going up rapidly, both in Osaka and Shanghai, and only actual experience for a period of years will demonstrate which of these locations is the better. My own judgment, after a close examination of every item in the cost of production, is Japan. In this contest for the cotton trade of Asia, the United States must supply more and more of the raw cotton. The improvement in the number of the yarn spun and in the quality of the cloth woven simply means a larger proportion of American cotton. Two new lines of Japanese steamships have been projected this year, and these ships are to run between the United States and Japan. While Osaka is the center of the cotton-yarn industry, the flourishing city of Nagoya is the center of cotton-cloth manufacture. Here I found several mills turning out a great variety of goods, mostly for home consumption. The export of $50,000,000 of cotton cloth to China and Korea will be no great achievment for Japan before the close of the century.

The district of Japan best worth studying from an industrial point of view is undoubtedly that around the Bay of Osaka, including the cities of Hyogo, Kyoto, and Osaka, and aggregating a population of 3,750,000. Here the mighty city growing up at the head of the Inland Seas can draw its supply of cheap labor. Within a hundred miles north and south, Osaka and the great commercial port of Kobe have a population of over 16,000,000, and within this radius may be found (excepting Tokyo and Yokohama) all the large cities of Japan. Cross the bay, only sixty miles away, and you have the island of Shikoku with 3,000,-

000 more. Here is a tributary population greater than that around London, and compared with which New York and its environments seem a thinly settled district and Chicago an unsettled area. From this center of industrial energy, Japan has a splendid outlet through the Inland Seas, and can supply China, now open to commerce and manufactures, rapidly developing Korea and Formosa, which the Japanese are now civilizing, and when the great Siberian railroad is completed, Osaka can send its goods direct to London from Vladivostok by a water journey of a few days. Surely the possibilities of New Japan are full of hope and forecast future prosperity for the Empire.

Should Japan take up the manufacture of woolen and worsted goods as she has done cotton, her weavers could give Europe and America some surprises and dumfound those who claim there is nothing in Japanese competition. A constant supply of cheap wool from Australia makes it possible, while the samples of Japanese woolen and worsted cloth and dress goods which I examined while there indicate that in this branch of textiles the Japanese are as much at home as in silk and cotton. They are also doing good work in fine linens, though so far the quantities produced are small.

In the rug district of Sakaye and the matting district of Okayama, the schools are depopulated to find children for these industries. The wages of the tiny mites thus employed are as low as two sen, about equivalent to one cent, per day, and sometimes range as high as three cents. The pay for adults of both sexes in these districts and in all the textile trades rarely exceeds ten cents American money. For this sum a Japanese can live, from his point of view, quite comfortably. The export of these articles from Japan in 1893 was $2,115,330; 1894, $3,199,565; in 1895, $5,079,271. Both of these industries will quadruple before 1900. The sudden influx of the Japanese umbrella, something like 2,000,000 exported in 1894, has caused anxiety among umbrella makers in the United States, though at present most of the product goes to China. These are some of the facts that point to the importance of Japanese competition. There is no necessity for making it a political question, but there seems to me at least to be a great necessity for a full and proper understanding of the changes going on in both Japan and China by reason of the introduction of modern appliances into countries where labor is so cheap,

and the environments of labor and cost of living so different from those which we confront at home in the United States.

The object of this article is not to prove any theory, but to lay before the intelligent people of the country the facts in relation to this controversy, so that they may form their own judgment. The question of "pauper labor" does not enter here, because with the exception of the employment of children, which is wrong, and the fact that Japan has no factory laws, laborers of both sexes seem well fed, happy and content with their environments. While it is not claimed that the Japanese are really competitors of the United States, it is claimed that these facts indicate that they might prove serious competitors in certain branches of industry. There are enthusiasts, who, for the sake of a theory, seem ever ready to brush to one side the facts. For instance, our United States Minister to Japan, Hon. Edwin Dun, a resident of Tokyo for twenty-five years, hastens to assure the American public that this talk of Japanese competition is all moonshine. The new minister from Japan to this country, Hon. Hoshi Toru, immediately on his arrival, gives out similar information for consumption on this side the Pacific. Every person interested in swelling the exports from Japan to this country declares with equal vehemence that Japanese competition is a myth. There has also been of late a great deal of talk emanating from these same gentlemen about increasing American trade with Japan. What does it all amount to? Simply an enormous increase of Japanese trade with the United States. This tells the story:

IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES TO JAPAN, 1895.

Kerosene oil	$3,039,254
Raw cotton	2,338,177
Hides and leather	787,300
Flour	406,000
Total	$6,570,731
Total imports	9,271,911
Deduct the staple imports from total	6,570,731
Our miscellaneous trade with Japan	$2,701,180
Against this we purchased of Japan last year	$53,991,625

The problem briefly stated in round figures is this: We buy of Japan about $54,000,000 worth of goods; Japan buys of us $9,000,000, mostly staples; Japan takes our fifty-four millions

and buys $56,000,000 of England, and England, not to be outdone by Japan in generosity, buys about seven millions of that country. All this is sad, and discouraging and humiliating, I know, but it is true as the gospel. That it is true, would seem to me one reason why the people of the United States must look at the question of Japanese competition free from all sentimental considerations. In other words, we must protect our own industry and our own labor. The importer, who seems to "run the show" to suit himself, secures a slice of the cake coming and going. He is as ready to buy of England as to sell to the United States—for a consideration. The question of home production, the employment of labor, or wages paid is of no consequence to him. In full possession of a good thing, he would indeed be foolish to make much of it. So he and his friends drag the red herring over the trail, as it were, by talking of bicycle shops turning out "ten wiggly-wobbly looking wheels per month"; of lucifer match factories, manufacturing "unstrikable matches"; of a "handful of floor mats," a few "sample tooth-brushes" and "jute rugs"; and, when all else fails, they start the cry of "political boojums" for the Presidential year.

Meantime, as we have seen, Japanese foreign trade has leaped up to three hundred million dollars, and the Empire has become an element well worthy of consideration, both in Europe and America, in connection with industrial and commercial matters.

While the foreign importers of Yokohama or Kobe (principally Englishmen), who do four-fifths of the business for the Japanese producer, industriously spread the notion that Japanese competition and Japanese industrial progress are twin myths, or bogies of the politicians and labor leaders in the United States and of bimetallists in England, the esteemed Japanese at home, with the seriousness which characterizes the race, indulge in very different reflections in relation to their progress. When in Japan I had the pleasure of meeting, among other statesmen and officials, Mr. Kaneko, Vice-Minister of Agriculture and Commerce. I found him a man of intelligence and foresight, and of wide experience in economical and statistical matters. Educated in one of the great European universities, he is up to the spirit of the age in all that relates to Japan and her industrial and commercial future. I am indebted to Mr. Kaneko's department for

many valuable reports. Any utterances of his should carry special weight. During the last two weeks of my stay in Japan Mr. Kaneko was engaged in a personal inspection of the manufactures and industries of Japan. He visited the same districts I visited during my stay there. In a speech addressed to a meeting of representatives of Chambers of Commerce throughout the Empire, held in May in Hakata, Fukuoka, Mr. Kaneko said:

"Japan is possessed of qualifications admirably fitted for making her a country of manufactures. Her population is comparatively large and labor is cheap.

"The Japanese are gifted with powerful eyes, hands and brains, and the Americans are terror-stricken at this.

"The cotton spinners of Manchester are known to have said that while the Anglo-Saxons had passed through three generations before they became clever and apt hands for the spinning of cotton, the Japanese have acquired the necessary skill in this industry in ten years' time, and have now advanced to a stage where they surpass the Manchester people in skill.

"The Japanese are unrivalled in the world for cleverness, and their future is truly awe-inspiring to contemplate."

"Furthermore," added Mr. Kaneko, "the position of Japan is very convenient for the purpose of importing raw cotton from China and India and wool and other raw materials from Australia. This country is naturally adapted to manufactures, and a wonderful advancement has been made in late years in respect to cotton spinning, weaving, and paper manufacturing. We have also begun to make excellent blankets.

"On account of Japan being a volcanic country, good sulphuric acid can be procured, the acid imported from China and India having been totally supplanted by the home product in the local markets.

"Englishmen have felt considerable uneasiness on seeing the prosperous state of business at Kawaguchi, Osaka. This is not my own personal opinion, but I have actually heard so from foreigners who have visited Japan for the purpose of inspecting trade. A commissioner recently sent out by merchants and manufacturers of Manchester was astonished at the development of the industries of Japan. On one occasion this gentleman visited the Department of Agriculture and Commerce, and remarked that he did not expect this country to be so abundant in raw materials. He was surprised at the skill shown in weaving, and saw excellent blankets being made at Omori from old rags.

"If the Japanese are so clever in utilizing useless materials for manufacturing useful articles, foreigners will be at a loss what to do in competing with the Japanese when the island is thrown open to them."

This will be done before the end of the present century.

To sustain the Vice-Minister of Agriculture, I quote from a recently published report of the Japanese Consul at Montreal, Mr. T. Nosse:

"Now, returning to the subject we have started with, viz., the articles we can supply the foreign market, I may repeat that it is a grievous mis-

take to suppose that Japan can offer nothing but fancy goods, at fancy prices. Yes, sir, it is a great mistake, for we are now out in the world's market for staple goods. Take, for instance, our silk handkerchiefs. They used to be bought and sold just for the sake of their oddity, or of the fancy embroideries on them; but now they are used and admired for their cheapness, durability, and comfort above all, which cannot be approached by any other material.

"And then our silk piece goods—they were at first exported only for fancy purposes, but now they bid fair with European products as staple dress goods. I have been through some of the great establishments in this city, and what I have seen in these places is evidence to prove that ours can compete with the French goods, both in design, price, and popularity. Jute and rug carpets there on exhibition are no fancy goods at fancy prices, but are just the sort of useful homestead articles to remain in public favor always."

When Mr. Kaneko tells his friends of the United Chamber of Commerce at Hakata that "the Americans are terror-stricken," I have no doubt he had some of the facts I have presented in mind. An increase in this period of over forty-fold in the exports of textile goods I must confess is rather disturbing, especially to our silk industry, now partially protected by an *ad valorem* instead of specific duty. When Mr. Kaneko modestly attributes to an Englishman the statement that the Japanese spinners and weavers surpass those of Manchester, he simply gives utterance to an indisputable truth. When he furthermore says, "The Japanese are unrivalled in the world for cleverness and their future is truly awe-inspiring to contemplate," he undoubtedly has in mind the figures presented above from his own department, showing that ten years ago the value of the exports of matches was about $60,000, whereas this year they will reach a value of $5,000,000; that the sum of $935 in 1885 would have bought all the floor matting sent from Japan, while last year the exports aggregated $3,461,369; that last year 2,000,000 European umbrellas were sent into the world's markets, valued at about $750,000, against $1,765 worth in 1885; that Sakaye cotton and hemp rugs are making similar headway. Perhaps Mr. Kaneko may be a little impetuous in his expressions, but he is nearer the truth than those who make a business of belittling this remarkable industrial progress and deriding Japanese competition.

Nor does the case of Japanese industrial progress rest on any one's opinion. It is best studied by a glance at the facts. The following figures, which are from official sources, show that

Japanese commerce and industrial enterprise were greatly developed after the war. Here we have it:

(1) RAILWAYS.

	No. of Companies.	Capital, Silver Dollars.
Railroad companies having permission of Government to build	80	$141,953,000
Railroad companies projected	125	202,006,000
	205	$343,959,000
Electric and horse cars	34	20,249,000
	239	$364,208,000

(2) BANKS.

	No. of Banks.	Capital.
Increased funds	46	$18,435,000
Newly established	132	89,560,000
	178	$107,995,000

(3) INDUSTRY.

	No. of Establishments.	Capital.
Cotton mills	49	$29,582,000
Silk mills	24	10,295,000
Weaving factories	19	9,425,000
Mining and metallurgical companies	22	8,185,000
Electric works	15	11,620,000
Other industrial works	58	17,489,000
	187	$86,596,000

(4) COMMERCE.

	No. of Companies.	Capital.
Insurance works	14	$22,600,000
Exchanges	26	6,240,000
Trades	11	8,376,000
Navigation and ship-building	28	14,275,000
Other commercial enterprises	47	12,156,000
	126	$63,647,000
Total	730	$622,446,000

There are other signs of commercial and industrial progress, but the above is condensed and striking. The large cities of Japan I found filled with industrial energy, while in the country districts through which I traveled the click of the shuttle and the whir of the spinning wheel may be heard in almost every cottage. Manufacturing seems to run right along the lines of agriculture. The mulberry tree, the silkworm, the filature, the spun thread, the woven cloth, the dyeing and the finishing of *habutai*, handkerchiefs, and crapes are not infrequently combined in one establishment. The background of real handicraft, with labor so cheap and so industrious as in Japan, carried on in the country districts, will be hard to beat, especially when aided by the latest modern machinery.

Japan has an industrial army that has gone into the conflict of nations with whatever implement it had at hand. It has not waited until every man was equipped with the latest modern appliances, but has begun making excellent articles with the tools within its reach. In Osaka, it is no exaggeration to say, I saw the methods of a thousand years ago, side by side with the latest and most ingenious labor-saving devices. The quotations from the Rice Exchange were being waved by flags from peak to peak, within a stone's throw of the Post Office Building, where could be heard the click of the telegraph instruments, and the "hello" of the telephone girl in her *kimono*. In the magnificently equipped cotton-spinning and weaving factories, in paper mills, in some of the large silk factories, in the clock and watch factories, in the machine shops of Japan, I have seen the most modern English, German, and American machinery, and forces of men and women as thoroughly organized and as fully equipped as any on earth.

On the other hand, within the shadow of these immense establishments in the Osaka district, where tall chimneys remind one of Manchester, Philadelphia, and Chicago, thousands of human beings labor with tools so crude and implements so antique that you are taken back to the cities of the ancient world.

These tremendous contrasts, to my mind, show the courage of the Japanese. He simply throws away the old device when he can secure the new. Like all good workmen, however, he does not stand idly by waiting for the better implements. He pounds away at his rice, runs off beautiful silken threads from the ancient spinning wheel, plies the hand dextrously at all occupations, as he did a thousand years ago, wholly oblivious of the hum and rattle of the modern machinery in the surrounding factories. He cannot afford to stop, but he is none the less awaiting his turn to secure the newer machine. When Japan is fully equipped with the latest machinery, it will, in my opinion, be the most potent industrial force in the markets of the world.

ROBERT P. PORTER.

THE CANADIAN ELECTIONS AND THEIR RESULT.

BY J. W. RUSSELL.

THE recent Liberal victory in Canada resembles the overthrow of an established order rather than one of those periodical changes which we look for in the ordinary working of party government. From September 17, 1878, until June 23 last the Conservative party ruled the Dominion. At no time in that period, except during the past year, had there been an opposition strong enough to prevent the Conservative leaders from imposing their policy upon an obedient majority in the House of Commons. During a part of their eighteen years' lease of power a partial acquiescence in the protective system, which had given political control into the hands of the Conservatives, had begun to spread even among the ranks of their opponents. In the general election of 1887 the Liberal leader promised that the protective tariff, the so-called "National Policy," would not be interfered with in the event of his success ; and ever since then some concession more or less necessary has been made to the cry of alarm raised against a too sudden disturbance of protection. Questions of emotional patriotism, radiating from the feeling of attachment to the mother country, had been dexterously interwoven in the web of beliefs and practices which had secured Conservative success ; and, rightly or wrongly, these questions had on more than one occasion exerted a decisive influence in the exigencies of party struggle.

The causes which led to the defeat of the Conservatives, as well as the change of Canadian policy resulting from it, are eminently worthy of notice. Standing midway, as Canada does, between the democratic federalism of the Republic and the limited monarchy of Great Britain, interest must increase in the contemplation of her commercial, industrial, and political aims.

Americans cannot be indifferent to the growth of an English-speaking power on their northern border, though, in recent years, they may have viewed its progress with mixed feelings, whose dominant tinge has been imparted by the attitude of Canadian Toryism. This election opens up to them a possible change of view.

The two main issues of the contest—tariff reform and the Manitoba school question—have for some time received a considerable share of public attention. They touched essential factors in the young life of the Dominion, and had compelled discussion of a strenuous and exciting character. The vigor or languishment of national industry, freedom or bondage in the expression of electoral opinion, the letter of the Constitution against its spirit—these were the broadly opposed meanings which the campaign presented to the Liberals; on the other hand, the Conservatives stood for the maintenance of protection, opposed any change supposed to involve commercial dependence upon the United States with its corollary of political dependence, and advocated the coercion of Manitoba in restoring the system of separate schools which had been abolished by that province in 1890.

In 1878 a Liberal Government, under the premiership of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, was defeated on the protective issue, and a tariff averaging thirty-five per cent. on dutiable imports displaced a revenue tariff of seventeen and a half per cent. The fiat had gone forth that Canada was no longer to be flooded with the manufactures of the United States, and a nation industrially independent was to be reared on the basis of protection. The new order of affairs started auspiciously, and for a few years seemed to justify itself. At the same time, the expenditure of large sums of borrowed money on great public works, the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the land speculations resulting therefrom, added a fictitious volume of prosperity with which protection was exclusively credited. New lines of manufacture sprang up, and the enthusiasm of a people which had apparently found industrial deliverance supported the political party which had wrought all this good. As business prospered, the opposition to the new tariff seemed increasingly futile.

Between 1887 and 1891 the Liberals changed their policy to "unrestricted reciprocity" or "commercial union" with the

United States, on the ground that free access to the markets of the United States was more desirable than all other commercial advantages. This policy gained many adherents, but was checked and discredited by its alleged political consequences. It seemed possible of realization only by the making of a common protective tariff between Canada and the United States as against the rest of the world. This accomplished, what would inevitably follow? Commercial union, it was claimed, could only be a prelude to political absorption; and the mere thought of such a result was enough to change the storm centre from tariffs to treason, from the discussion of economic issues to the problem of national existence. Suggestive inferences were drawn from the German Zollverein, which paved the way for the German Empire. Discrimination against Great Britain was charged, and truthfully, against the proposed change; and at the general elections of 1891 it was decisively rejected. The Liberals then returned to their former advocacy of a revenue tariff.

In the meantime, a day of reckoning had come in the application of a test whose validity could not be gainsaid, and which comprehended all minor issues of fact and policy. The census of 1891 showed a dishearteningly small increase of population, the whole Dominion having added but 508,000 to its inhabitants during the decade of 1881-91—a smaller increase than that of the single State of Minnesota during the same period. This revelation was conclusive, and the Conservative party irreparably injured by it. It was vain to argue in support of a system under which more than 1,000,000 Canadians, native and foreign-born, had been expatriated to the United States; and no explanations or comparisons could reconcile the facts with any hope of success. There were, indeed, subordinate proofs of failure. The coal and iron industries had remained practically stationary; the richest mineral deposits were undeveloped; the shipping interest, formerly so prosperous, had declined nearly a half in twelve years; and many industries which had started well had been wiped out by competition in a narrow market. But it seemed unnecessary to give subsidiary proof when the census had given the final and conclusive one. The recently won Liberal success, in so far as it related to the tariff question, naturally followed from the publication of the census returns, and from the business depression which has since continued. The people had given the national

policy a long and fair trial, and nothing could hide or palliate its failure.

Whatever may be said as to the relative importance of the two issues, there is no doubt as to which more deeply excited public feeling. The Manitoba school question strongly stirred the fires of racial and religious prejudice. The French and English-speaking elements of Canadian nationality confront each other in proportions naturally conducive to a powerful rivalry, heightened by traditions of hereditary enmity; and it has taken expert political management and the growth of mutual toleration to gain the comparative harmony which has thus far prevailed. The French Canadians are, politically, loyal to Great Britain and to the federal pact under which they live; but they are also passionately devoted to their racial development and their religion. The Pope has nowhere more faithful spiritual subjects; they have been called the most Catholic community in the world. The school question imposed upon them a severe test—a course of action in which religious subserviency and civic duty contended for the mastery. The legal and technical details of that question are of little interest to American readers, and with its salient points they are already familiar. The upshot of the long struggle in the courts was a decision of the Imperial Privy Council, which in effect, did not finally decide, but referred the question back to the Dominion Government with the result of its introduction as an issue in federal politics. Manitoba was ordered to restore the separate schools, and replied in a vigorous refusal; the Government tried to pass a remedial bill and failed, after which it appealed to the country to endorse its policy of coercion. In doing so its chief reliance was upon the Catholic hierarchy; and the well-known mandate of the Quebec bishops, commanding all the faithful in that province to support the government, was deemed a weapon of such strength and edge as nothing could resist. This unwise course occasioned the greatest surprise of the election, and forty-seven members of the House of Commons, out of a total of sixty-five in Quebec, were returned in direct opposition to their spiritual guides and in support of their eloquent fellow-countryman, the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the Liberal leader. This unexpected revolt has given new hope and meaning to the national life and progress. Hitherto considered the least enlightened and independent portion of the Dominion, Quebec has

"stamped her strong foot and said she would be free," and has given a memorable rebuke to arrogant clericalism. The distinct functions of church and state have been splendidly emphasized just when and where the lesson was most needed; and the vexatious question of priestly interference in politics, which has had a continuous existence in Canada since confederation, will never again exert its former power of disturbance. The school question in all probability will, as a result of the election, be removed from the federal arena and referred to the Manitoba government, which has promised to deal generously in the matter. Mr. Laurier has promised the appointment of a commission of investigation, whose duty will be an impartial consideration of the educational condition of the Catholic minority; and all possible remedial action which can be taken in its favor without actually compromising the public-school system—which is deeply rooted in the affections of the people—will doubtless meet with the approval of the provincial authorities.

The new Liberal administration will naturally turn its first attention to the tariff. It was quite evident from the character of some journalistic comments, and more especially from certain recent Washington despatches, that the Liberal policy in this respect has been partially misunderstood. The fault lies chiefly with the Canadian Conservative press, which has repeatedly impugned the loyalty of the Liberals and represented their tariff principles as the cover of annexationist designs. This was false; the annexationist propaganda never had any considerable number of friends in either party, and such as it had were about equally drawn from both. But the repetition of the falsehood has produced an impression that the Liberals are as excessively friendly as the Conservatives were unduly hostile to the Republic. No one who knows Canadian sentiment can doubt that both parties are firmly attached to British connection, and that any weakening of that attachment is not in the thought of any-man of political prominence in the Dominion. It is true that the party now in power have been more genuinely anxious than their opponents for a measure of reciprocity with the United States, but they were never prepared to go unpatriotic lengths in the obtaining of it. Rightly or wrongly, they never admitted, as a party, the annexationist trend of their former political platform; still less could any possible change of political allegiance be involved in their

present one. They have promised to make no tariff amendments without due notice to the interests affected, and a careful inquiry and deliberation will precede any legislative changes, which will chiefly be the lowering of duties upon the raw material of manufactures. As nearly as can be inferred from the utterances of responsible men and leading journals before the election, the new tariff will average about twenty per cent. upon dutiable imports.

It cannot be denied that in recent years, and especially during the past year, the political outlook of the Dominion has been affected by the growth of the imperial sentiment. Twenty or twenty-five years ago any scheme of federation founded thereon would not have been seriously received by the Canadian people: it was utterly beyond the range of practical politics. The views of the Manchester school were then strong in England, and were accepted as the proper interpretation of colonial destiny. All this has been changed, and during the past year or two Canadian politics has seen the final effacement of ideas which conflict with British connection. The Venezuela embroglio, the South African question, and the progress of Australian federation have strongly reinforced imperial feeling, which hopes for a permanent organization of the Empire on a federal basis. Opponents of the idea have ridiculed the lack of its embodiment in any definite plan, but are compelled to admit the vigor of the sentiment behind it; nor are they disposed to belittle the essential foundation which such sentiment supplies.

A political ideal cherished by Great Britain and her self-governing colonies will, in the case of a people whose genius rules in practical politics, find some way of realization. The first step has already been taken by means of a series of conferences, representing different parts of the Empire, and designed to investigate the conditions under which commerce between them may be more largely developed. Such was the aim of the well-known Colonial Conference, held in Ottawa two years ago; also the conference of Chambers of Commerce held in London during June last; and without doubt future meetings of representative commercial interests will continue these investigations with the object of initiating practical results on this line.

Preferential trade is naturally associated with the new departure; and the attitude of the Dominion, as the largest of the self-

governing colonies, will be influential in determining its progress or its retrogression. The policy of the Liberal administration harmonizes, partially at least, with the conditions which would be imposed from the British point of view. Mr. Chamberlain, in a recent speech before the Canadian Club in London, declared the indispensable prerequisite of a preferential tariff to be freer trade between the different members of the Empire, involving the abolition of protection by such of the colonies as had adopted it; and the first step in consonance with that declaration has just been taken by the Dominion, whose present tariff against British goods will certainly be lowered in the near future. Whatever reception the British masses may give to the preferential idea, it may be said that neither political party in Canada has taken decided ground for or against it. Sir Charles Tupper strongly favors it, and Mr. Laurier, judging from some of his speeches, does not see any insuperable objection to it. From the rank and file of their respective followers no general expression of opinion can as yet be expected, as the discussion of the question has only begun.

In Canada there is a wide-spread feeling of relief as a result of the election, and renewed hope of quickened progress in the near future. Pressing matters of domestic policy will be vigorously grappled with by the new government. The settlement of the great Northwest, which has been long retarded by railway monopoly and a bad land policy, will receive all possible attention and encouragement. The recent discovery of incomparably rich gold deposits in British Columbia, and the vast quantities of nickel ore in Ontario, offer a lucrative field to the capitalist; and the general mineral resources of the country will, it is believed, gain an impetus from the change of industrial policy. Increased wealth and population are the core of Canada's most exigent needs; the framework of government and institutions is strong, but has for some time comparatively lacked the vitalizing movement of business enterprise. Protection, having been tried and found wanting, will gradually but surely be eliminated from the list of contentious questions. Other matters, whose importance has been quite overshadowed by the two main issues, will likely engage the attention of the government; such as improved and enlarged canals, perfecting water communication between the head of Lake Superior and the Atlantic seaboard, a new fast ocean

mail service, and the relation of Newfoundland to confederation. This is by no means a complete enumeration of the problems of progress which press for solution at a time of urgency, but also a time of hope.

Among the planks of the Republican platform formulated a few weeks ago at St. Louis, was one expressing the hope that Europe would withdraw from the affairs of this continent, and that the British people of its northern half would, by their own consent, become incorporated with the Republic. This expression of good will to Canada is genuinely appreciated; but the invitation is not likely to be accepted. It is gratifying, however, to know that the language of courtesy and friendliness is officially adopted by a great political party; and it will tend to make less noticeable any fugitive expressions, containing veiled threats, and uttered by irresponsible politicians. In this connection may be mentioned a resolution passed by the Dominion House of Commons shortly after the first echoes of the Venezuela affair had died away. It contained a strong profession of loyalty to Great Britain, but coupled with it a declaration of friendliness towards the United States. Among English-speaking nations, the exchange of such expressions may surely be said to spring from something deeper than the formalism of diplomacy.

J. W. RUSSELL.

WILD TRAITS IN TAME ANIMALS.

VI.—DOGS AND CATS.

BY DR. LOUIS ROBINSON.

We now come to the domestic animals which are the immediate sharers of our homes, and I hope to show that we have quite as much to learn from the habits of the cat and the dog as from those of the creatures which we have already discussed.

The dog, in his every action, tells us that his forefathers lived in communities banded together for self-protection and for procuring food. The cat's habits show it to have been a solitary prowler from the earliest times. The one is an instinctive socialist; the other is an individualist, pure and simple. Just as the horse yields readily to the will of man because the young animals of every wild mob were submissive to their natural leaders, so the dog is ready to obey the authority of his superiors in the new "pack" in which he finds himself.

I have endeavored to show, in an article on "Canine Manners and Morals," published in another periodical, that the dog regards his master as the chief of his pack, and the other members of the household as his comrades. His very teachableness and intelligence owe their primary origin to the fact that game had to be secured by co-operation of the most elaborate kind. The wild *canidæ*, and especially those which were among the ancestors of the domestic dogs, often prey upon animals larger than themselves, and therefore, intelligent concerted action was an absolute necessity of existence, for a single wolf could not pull down a buffalo or a moose.

Cats, on the contrary, prey as a rule, upon creatures smaller and weaker than themselves; and, from the fact that they stalk their victims silently, they do not find it profit-

able to band together. Being naturally solitary and independent, they do not, when captured, become members of the family in the same way that dogs do, but seem to regard the human inhabitants of the house rather as a part of the furniture than as comrades.

If we carefully consider what kind of raw materials for an opinion about mankind the wild cat brought into captivity, we find that they were of an utterly different nature from those possessed by the dog. The dog was constantly in company of his fellows, and so when he became associated with man he transferred his loyalty and many other mental habits and sentiments to the new government, just as a retired soldier carries his habit of prompt obedience into civil service. To put the case in a nutshell, the dog's master is regarded as the "boss" of the pack. This way of treating new things as part and parcel of what is old and familiar is common enough. When some South Sea Islanders first saw a horse they exclaimed, "What a very large pig"; and, doubtless, when Boston was first named, many who entered it thought more of the little town on the Lincolnshire coast than of the new city.

But the cat was a solitary roamer, whose companions were the trees of its native forests. It found a home in the hollow trunks and safety among the branches. How do we know that the cat's ancestors were dwellers in the forest? Because every kitten takes to a tree as readily as a duck to water. Also because nearly all forest dwellers are mottled in color, so that they may not be conspicuous among the light and shadows beneath the trees. While I was considering what was the probable view held by cats about human beings, it was suggested by one ingenious friend that probably they regard a man as a kind of locomotive tree, pleasant to rub against, the lower limbs of which afford a comfortable seat, and from whose upper branches occasionally drop tit-bits of mutton and other luscious fruits. We may laugh at the theory, but it has quite a respectable string of facts behind it to back it up. If the Kanakas argued from the pig to the horse, why should the cat not pass from the familiar tree to the unfamiliar organism called man?

At no time can you better contrast the habits of the dog and the cat than when they are feeding. A dog will either bolt his morsel whole as soon as it is given him or else run away to some

quiet spot where he can devour it at his leisure. He always acts as if he were in fear lest his treasure should be snatched from him; and when he is gnawing a bone, he will not allow even his master to approach without showing displeasure. In the wild state a struggle for the best of the spoil took place directly an animal was captured; and, as I have already said, your dog pays you the compliment of regarding you as a member of his pack. Hence, he thinks it probable that you would like to take the bone from him and gnaw it yourself.

As you have doubtless often observed, the cat acts in a very different manner. When a piece of food is offered to her she first carefully smells it, then takes it in a deliberate and gingerly way and sits down to eat it at her leisure. There is none of that hasty stowing the morsel into the one place where no dishonest rival can get at it, which we observe in the dog. It is plain that the cat is accustomed to take its meals in undisturbed solitude. Its master or mistress is not regarded as a possible rival. If the dog's hunting motto is "the more the merrier," the cat's is "the fewer the better fare." When you have to make a dinner off a mouse or a sparrow, the less company there is the better. It is easy to see that a cat's teeth and claws are not adapted for attacking large and powerful prey. Even that ridiculous and effeminate parasite, the fashionable pug, could make a better show in attacking a sheep or an ox than a cat.

It is often remarked that cats are more attached to places than to persons, whereas a dog will accompany his master and make himself at home anywhere. We see in these distinctive traits of character the remnants of certain wild habits. Naturalists tell us that wild cats nearly always choose some fixed spot as their permanent headquarters and devote their attention to the game in the immediate district. Packs of wild animals of the dog tribe, such as wolves, jackals, and dholes, on the contrary, range a great extent of country and make their lair at any convenient spot. Each is at home as long as he is with his fellows. Of course, when a swift creature, such as a deer or antelope, is run down, the chase would often end many miles away from the starting point. The weary and gorged pack would naturally lie down to sleep on the nearest spot which afforded a suitable bed.

As Darwin pointed out, whenever a dog lies down he curls

himself round several times, as if he were twisting the long grass of the prairie or jungle into a comfortable nest.

Although we may safely say that the dog is the most thoroughly tamed of any animal which we possess, yet it is easy to trace every faculty in him which we find useful to the needs of the time when he was wholly engaged in managing his own affairs.

It is worth while to take notice of any distinctive trait of dogs you are familiar with and to think out its probable origin under purely natural conditions. Thus the watchdog's habit of barking when a stranger approaches is clearly traceable to the alarm given by the sentries of the pack when an enemy approached their lair.

The cat, in spite of the domestic character it has acquired, is in reality the least tame of our animal servants. As far as its duties are concerned man has taught it practically nothing. Its methods of pursuing rats, mice, and birds are all entirely its own. It is indeed rather a wild animal which has taken up its residence in our houses for its own purposes than a servant or a slave.

In bringing this series of articles on *Wild Traits in Tame Animals* to a close, let me say again that it has been my aim to suggest rather than to instruct. I am a strong believer in the doctrine that if you want to get a good grip of any fact you must dig it out yourself. There is no doubt that while we are young our senses, such as sight and hearing, are more acute than in adult civilized life ; and our powers of observation generally are more alert. In solving the many problems in Natural History which have hitherto baffled our wise men these are the very faculties which are wanted. But they must be combined with the power to reflect on the evidence gathered, and to sift out the rubbish from among the wheat. Even the most learned men know so little of the complex conditions of animal life, that original research is within the power of any one who is content to begin as a careful observer of the facts to be noticed immediately around him.

LOUIS ROBINSON.

THE POWER OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

BY HENRY W. LUCY.

In a case affecting theatrical rights recently heard in the London law courts, two well-known managers appearing in the witness box took the opportunity of affirming their absolute disregard, not to say contempt, for articles published in the press purporting to be dramatic criticism. One in the excitement of the competitive examination said he never read notices of pieces in which he was personally concerned. In a calmer moment his colleague wrote to the newspapers to explain that his assertion was strictly limited to notices of pantomimes and did not affect criticism passed upon comedies and other high-class workmanship in vogue at the theatre with which he was connected. The other manager remained impenitent, or at least mute.

This attack on the alleged potency of the press, as affecting public opinion, is the more notable, as coming from a quarter where scepticism on the matter seems least likely to exist. If it be true that the press notices of plays have no value, it must be admitted that managers take extraordinary pains to procure what they believe to be worthless. The incident is useful as raising the question whether journalists have for these many years past been living in a fool's paradise; whether the public have remained under a delusion, and whether "that mighty engine, the press," is after all what Mr. Carlyle liked to call a "simulacrum." Can a newspaper or a congeries of newspapers make the fortune of a play, sell a book or a picture, or make the fortunes of a man?

I think the answer is that everything depends on the play, the book, the picture, or the man. If there is nothing of merit in any of them, not all the newspapers in the kingdom, morning and evening combined, with the weeklies thrown in, can force

them into favor with the public. But, undoubtedly, given merit or capacity, recognition of the press is of inestimable value.

It must nevertheless be admitted that the force of its influence is apparently not absolutely in proportion to its integrity of purpose or to its absolute freedom from personal motive. Since the Panama bubble burst, evidence has been forthcoming in abundant detail showing how the "opinion" of a large section of the French press was sold and bought in much the same direct way in which the domestic *gigot* is provided, or a new hat procured. The managers, editors, and, where humbler fry got the chance, the contributors of respectable-looking journals, asked for so many thousand francs as the price of approval of the De Lesseps scheme, threatening if the money were not forthcoming to indignantly denounce it for the protection of the public.

Lower depths were reached in the more recent case of M. Lebaudy. This hapless inheritor of millions of francs, made in the sugar business, having been drawn by conscription, half a dozen newspapers fastened upon him like wasps on the oozing joints of the paternal sugar vats. Newspapers were even called into existence with the same high object in view. It simply was to keep an eye on the young conscript, and unless much money were forthcoming see that his wealth procured for him no privileges beyond those shared in common with his comrades. If supplies of money were withheld, the officers, commissioned and non-commissioned, who had anything to do with Lebaudy, were in the sacred name of France denounced for having sold their favors.

To the English newspaper reader it will appear that enterprise of this character would not pay. The influence wielded by journals capable of embarking upon it would be so obviously infinitesimal that it would not be worth while to hand out any money to pacify or suborn the harpies who conducted it. That amiable conviction is refuted by the fact. M. de Lesseps and his colleagues financing the Panama Canal, paid subventions to the French press representing an appreciable percentage on their takings from the French people. Poor Lebaudy gave with both hands to the journalistic brigands. They were insatiable, and the actuality of the power they boasted was demonstrated by the fact, confessed by the regimental doctor, that, with full

knowledge of the conscript's dangerous state of health, he dare not, for fear of these journals, furnish the certificate which in the case of a poorer man would have secured Lebaudy's discharge. So the young millionaire died of consumption in a military hospital.

That is a grim illustration of the power of the press, which, for the sake of an honorable profession, it is hoped is confined to the country that was the scene of its development. It is certain that nothing based upon its primer condition could happen in Great Britain. An English newspaper may be lacking in all the qualities that go to make a daily or a weekly news-sheet acceptable. But the poorest in condition is free from taint of deliberate blackmailing. There are occasionally hints current in financial circles of newspapers launched with the design of preying upon company promoters. But the mere suspicion of such design attached to a newspaper in London or any provincial centre of financial activity is sufficient to defeat the purpose of its proprietors. It forthwith loses any standing or influence it might have honestly attained. Its good word is not worth buying, nor is its hostility to be feared. It may be accepted as an unassailable axiom in respect of the English press that the higher is the standing of a newspaper, the wider the range of its influence, the more unapproachable it is by those who come with money bribes in hand.

Another malign influence from which the British press, as compared with the Continental press, is free is that of the ruling powers. At grave international crises, such as those which shook the world on the eve of Christmas and on the threshold of the New Year, we read of *mots d'ordre* being given from the highest quarters to the press throughout a particular imperial state. When certain journals set forth certain views, they are discussed in London and New York, not as the opinions of leading journals in either capital would be weighed elsewhere, but as indicating the attitude which the Emperor of Germany, the Czar, the Emperor of Austria, or the King of Italy is pleased to take at a particular juncture. That is a guidance that would be looked for in vain in a London newspaper. When a Conservative Government is in power in England it is customary to speak of the *Times*—it used to be the *Standard*—as "the ministerial organ." Whilst a Liberal ministry was yet with us the *Daily News* was so distinguished.

All that was meant was that the line taken in the editorial columns of these journals was the one Her Majesty's ministers were inclined or resolved to pursue. Such might, by accident, be the case. It is a reasonable conclusion that a journal in sympathy with the policy of a particular party should, at a given turn of events, fall in line with the leaders of it. That is, however, a very different thing from what obtains in the case of some well-known Continental journals, which, at particular crises, receive definite communications from ruling personages and must needs obey them. Probably the worst thing an English Prime Minister, desiring to further a particular line of policy, could do would be to send a message to the editor of the so-called ministerial organ, instructing him, or even inviting him, to adopt a stated line of argument or assertion.

The power of the press in England is mainly based on conviction of its honesty of purpose, and the cleanness of the hands of those who conduct and contribute to it. This inborn, carefully nurtured principle is indicated in such a detail as the scorn and indignation excited in journalistic circles at the mere suspicion that an economically transmitted cable message has been unduly elaborated in the sub-editorial room before it appears in print. The *Times* having, as its conductors thought, reason to believe that a news agency had so dealt with a message offered for publication in its columns, indignantly denounced the misplaced industry. The news agency, justly appreciating the fact that such an accusation, unrefuted, struck at its life as a prosperous business undertaking, forthwith brought a civil action with design to vindicate its integrity. Some of the best known Parisian papers, without fear of rebuke, habitually "convey" telegrams from the London press, re-write them, and present them to their readers as evidence of enterprise, regardless of cost. An English newspaper convicted of such a trick might at once close the shutters of its publishing office.

Another device to enlarge the circle of readers, familiar in France, and not absolutely unknown, I believe, in the United States, is the publication, in the form of reputable news, of the account of an earthquake, a thrilling murder, a rattling tornado, or a romantic suicide, the scene judiciously located. The fact that the story is wholly fabulous has the recommendation that it gives to the journal purveying it exclusive possession of the news.

Something of that kind once appeared in a London morning newspaper. It was a detailed account of a man and dog fight, the scene of which patient inquiry failed to localize, nor was any witness discovered to testify to the alleged occurrence. The managers of the journal in question having been themselves imposed upon, the paper did not permanently suffer. But the picturesque and really able journalist who had depicted the scene has disappeared from prominent places of English journalism.

A marked difference between the profession of journalism in England and its pursuit in the United States and France, is that in the former case it leads no whither beyond possible promotion, whilst in the two latter countries it is the avenue to the highest and most honorable employment in the state. Mr. Gladstone's brief government from 1892 to 1895 was distinguished by a departure, the novelty of which excited profound astonishment, not entirely dissociated from a vague feeling that something was wrong. The Prime Minister recommended nearly half a dozen working journalists to Her Majesty for the honor of knighthood.

In France, Ollivier, Clemenceau, and His Excellency M. Barére, are among the many who have laid down the journalist's pen to take up the minister's portfolio. In the United States the power of the press, as indicated by the personal advancement of prominent members of the guild, is even more frequently and systematically illustrated.

The British press have no parallel to the roll thus blazoned in America. It has, indeed, not even the beginning of such a list. Connection with the press in at least one direction actually disqualifies a man for an honor open to the ordinary citizen. Up to a recent date the Lord Chancellor, for occult reasons, declined to add to the Commission of the Peace a man, otherwise eligible, who was tainted by editorial or proprietorial connection with the press. Lord Herschell broke through this tradition in one or two instances. But his successor on the Woolsack, Lord Halsbury, has reverted to the old order of things.

I am aware of only two instances where the government of the day having patronage at their disposal have bestowed it upon a journalist. In 1869 the then editor of the *Daily News* was offered the practically sinecure post of editor of the *London Gazette*, to which is attached the salary of £800 a year. A writer on the

editorial staff of the same paper was later nominated to fill a vacancy in the post of examiner of plays. When last year, Mr. Pigott died, there was a rush of veteran journalists eager to secure the reversion of the post. But the minister in whose hand patronage was vested thought enough had been done for the press and a new examiner of plays was found in another profession.

This seems a hard case as compared with the condition of things established not only in the United States and France, but in many of the British colonies. I, for one, am not disposed to regret it. It contributes in no small degree to the absolute independence which is the proudest attribute of the British press. No man can serve two masters! A paper is more likely to thrive if its editor and staff of contributors are habituated to concentrate their attention on their work without contemplating the possibilities of obtaining a government berth at home or a diplomatic appointment abroad.

The power of the press in England might become even dangerously autocratic but for a lack of cohesion. If there existed amongst newspapers any organization akin to Trades Unions the British newspapers might rule the roost. Unfortunately (perhaps fortunately), every paper, whether daily or weekly, stands aloof from its contemporaries, or comes in contact with them only for the purposes of a scolding match. The idea in every British newspaper office, small or large, is that the sheet it turns out is, if not literally the only one printed that morning, the only one worthy of notice. This curious delusion is carried to such lengths that, for fear of breaking the spell, no well-regulated morning paper will mention another by name. If temptation to show how foolish or unreliable a neighbor has been prove irresistible, it is loftily alluded to as "a contemporary."

An example of how this lack of unity works in business relations is supplied in connection with the Royal Academy banquet. That is a prominent event of the year. The foremost public men, usually including the Prime Minister, attend and make speeches. The occasion is preeminently one for which those immediately concerned would desire to obtain the widest publicity. To some member on the committee occurred the happy thought that much prized places at the dinner table might be saved for other uses if only a single reporter were

invited to the banquet, he being engaged to supply to all the London newspapers a slip containing a full transcript of his notes. A place was accordingly reserved for the *Times* reporter, the other London newspapers being ignored.

Had there existed among the morning press any means or habit of taking counsel and common action together, this precious arrangement would have come to swift and sudden end. It required only that the newspapers thus ignored should boycott the Academy Banquet, and the next year the cause of offence would cease to exist. There was, however, no such machinery for inter-communication between the managers of the morning papers. The *Standard*, to its honor, took an independent course, and in its columns the speeches at the Academy dinner were left unreported. In 1886 the *Daily News*, coming under new editorship, took the same line. The Academicians held out for another year and then capitulated. The lesson has not borne other fruit and the London newspapers, each in its way a power in the land, solemnly stalk along their own pathway, ludicrously ignoring the existence of other pedestrians.

Possibly it is, on the whole, well that the British press should not be united after the fashion of the ancient guilds. If it were, its power in the land might more nearly approach that of the House of Commons than is already achieved.

H. W. Lucy.

ISSUES AND PROSPECTS OF THE CAMPAIGN.

BY SENATOR W. E. CHANDLER AND THE HON. JOSIAH QUINCY.

I.

BEFORE stating what are in fact the leading issues of the coming presidential canvass, a moment may be wisely spent in speculating as to what those issues might possibly have been. It cannot be said that the Republican claims for the votes of the people could have been placed upon any basis different from that laid down by the St. Louis Convention. The principal points put in issue were (1) protection to American industries by means of tariff duties on imported goods; (2) sound money as defined and understood by the great mass of the Republicans, and (3) a patriotic and positive foreign policy. It is also not conceivable that the canvass would have been materially different with any other candidate for President. The Republican party's presentation of its claims, indeed, has been substantially fixed and settled beyond change during several years past.

But the Democratic claim for votes might have been very different from what it in fact is. The platform might have been (1) sound money as understood by the Cleveland Democrats, and (2) hostility to protection by tariff duties in any form. In that event, with any candidate, the Democrats would have been badly beaten at the polls.

Or, on the other hand, the Democratic platform might have been (1) for sound money as above, and (2) as to protection, it might have recognized as unobjectionable in levying tariff duties incidental protection by discrimination in favor of home products. In this event the presidential canvass would have been comparatively free from excitement, possibly tame, flat, and uninteresting The Populists would have made little figure with their demon-

strations; the seceding silver Republicans would have accomplished little more than the carrying of three or four mountain States for silver; and although the South would have been generally Democratic, and the Republican victory would not have been overwhelming, yet the triumph would have been sure, complete, and in every way satisfactory in its essential results.

Passing from this speculation as to what the aspect of the presidential canvass possibly might have been, and coming to the actual situation, we find it to be this :

The claims of the Republicans are substantially as above indicated.

I. More distinctly, they are in favor of protection to American industries and to high wages for American labor by tariff duties imposed with the direct motive of affording such protection, while articles not produced in this country are to come in free of duty or with light duties, and in the case of these latter products the nations from which they come are to be induced upon the principle of reciprocity to admit free of duty the important staple products of the United States.

II. The Republicans are pledged to sound money ; that is to say, to absolute and unqualified opposition to the free and unlimited coinage of silver bullion by the United States alone as an immediate measure of legislation—which, if it followed as a result of the approaching presidential canvass, would send gold at once to a premium, and destroy the present parity between gold and silver.

Making now no statement of the other important but not equally vital issues of the pending canvass, the two above-stated principles are the fighting issues of the Republicans. To represent them, Major McKinley is the presidential candidate. His nomination was principally due to a popular demand for a return to protection as a governing principle of tariff legislation, which would not accept any other Republican as the best representative of that principle. He is certain to receive the willing support of every Republican satisfied with the principles of his party. Some objections growing out of the contest for his nomination have disappeared and will be forgotten during the campaign. Petty evils will always attend the movements of a great political party, but fortunately, in the case of the Republican party, such evils generally carry with them their own antidote ; and they have

done so in this case, as will appear in the course of the next year and a half.

Personally, Major McKinley is a man of upright character and life; warm and tender-hearted without being weak; intellectually strong, without being dogmatic; most thoroughly informed concerning the issues which he represents, and sure to constitute a cabinet of the ablest men of the nation, who, with the President, will prove safe and sound custodians of the national interests and the national honor.

The regular organization of the Democratic party, which has nominated Bryan and Sewall at Chicago, presents, against McKinley, protection, and sound money, a platform containing:

I. Denunciation of protection in any form. The absolute unconstitutionality either of direct or of incidental protection is not asserted as it was in the Cleveland platform of 1892, but the hostility of the Democratic party to protection of any sort is quite as distinctly marked as in the previous platform. No suggestion is made that if by any possibility the Democratic party has national power given to it, any law levying customs duties will be designed in any part to aid in protecting American products and the wages of American workmen from the competition of foreign products and the starvation wages of Europe and Asia.

The failure to "ease up" in that hostility to protection which has done so much to weaken the Democratic party during the last two years, is a marked feature, quite natural, to be sure, of a new political movement, the purpose of which is to enable the solid South, united with a sufficient number of Western States, to take possession of the national government.

II. A demand for unsound money; that is to say, for the immediate passage of a law which, without conditions, shall provide for receiving and coining at the mints of this country all the silver bullion which may be presented for coinage, at the ratio of 16 to 1, the parity between gold and silver to be thereby immediately broken, gold to be driven out of circulation, and the discarded silver of the whole world to be taken into our mints; all this as a fixed and permanent national policy.

A mere statement of the issues in the condensed form above adopted would seem to be sufficient to justify the prediction that there can be but one result of the canvass, namely, the triumph

of McKinley and the Republican party. There are, however, other pertinent facts to be considered.

On the money issue the Chicago Convention in effect fell to pieces. Two-thirds of the delegates being in favor of the money plank and having the power to nominate a candidate, the so-called sound-money Democrats from the North and East, who with their associates comprised a little less than one-third of the delegates, after having vainly struggled to prevent the adoption of that plank, sat silent in the Convention to the number of 160 while a candidate was being nominated. What these sound-money Democrats will do in the canvass is not yet apparent. They may content themselves without formal action, remain inactive in their respective localities, and allow or promote a shrinkage of the Democratic vote by Democratic abstentions and the casting of many Democratic ballots for McKinley; or there may be a sound-money Democratic National Convention, which will present another Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and the split in the party will thus become marked and formal. The extent of Mr. McKinley's triumph will hardly be varied whichever course the Northern Democrats pursue.

It is suggested that the Republicans, in order to get Democratic votes for Mr. McKinley, ought to moderate their tariff notions and recognize the demand for honest money as the paramount issue of the canvass. This suggestion is not wise. A Republican Congress, even with a clear, unconditional majority for protection in the Senate, which it does not seem possible to obtain, will not be likely to adopt an extreme tariff measure. But the tariff plank must stand as it is written, binding all Republicans, or we shall lose more Republican votes than we shall gain Democratic votes. On the other hand, a sound-money Democrat can vote for McKinley on the currency issue without committing himself in the least to protection or to any further connection with the Republican party.

What the Populists will do is at the moment of this writing quite uncertain. Undoubtedly Bryan is their logical candidate, for he has been of late more a Populist than a Democrat; yet on the other hand is Sewall, the candidate for Vice-President, who, although he theoretically favors the free coinage of silver, is a millionaire who has become wealthy in connection with protected monopolies. Even if the Populists consummate their seizure of

the Democratic party, and formally endorse their representative, Mr. Bryan, and accept Sewall as well, and whether the fight in favor of McKinley is hard or easy, the result, it now seems, will be an overwhelming Republican triumph.

The confident tone of the foregoing prediction is not based solely upon an opinion as to the result of a simple, unclouded contest between the partisans of free coinage of silver, on the one side, and the advocates of what will be called sound money, on the other. On that naked issue, unaffected by other considerations, it must be admitted that the fight would be a doubtful one. The supporters of Bryan would claim that it was a fight between silver monometallism on the one hand and gold monometallism on the other. On this issue thus sharply drawn there would be danger of Republican defeat in every Southern State, in all the States west of the Missouri River, and in some of the States east of the Mississippi, particularly in Illinois and Indiana. The evils of gold monometallism would be pointed out in strong, and, in the main, justifiable language. The necessity, as between the single gold standard and the single silver standard, of adopting the latter would be brought home adroitly and effectively to all persons burdened by debts; also to the agricultural producers and to a very large proportion of all the other producers, and of the merchants of the country.

It will be difficult in such a heated and excited contest as is evidently before the 12,000,000 American voters for editors and speakers to adopt any middle ground between the two extremes of gold monometallism and silver monometallism. Conservatives like myself, who are bimetallists from conviction, will find it difficult to prove to the acceptance of the voters that the McKinley Republicans or the sound-money Democrats, whether the latter do or do not present a candidate, are as much against permanent acquiescence in the single gold standard as we are opposed to the single silver standard. Yet such is in truth the position of the Republican party. Such was its attitude in 1892. In its platform of 1896, also, it pledges itself to promote bimetallism. The Republicans in Congress, when the purchasing clause of the silver law of 1890 was repealed, voted for the following bimetallic declaration:

"And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both

gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets, and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts."

The above views are the opinions to-day of four-fifths of the Republicans of the country. They ought to have been more forcibly expressed than they are in the national platform. Yet they are there, clearly defined and honestly uttered. Whenever the wild Democratic and Populist craze for breaking the parity between the two metals and adopting free silver coinage shall pass away, as did the greenback craze of twenty years ago, the Republican party, if in power in the nation, will address itself to the work of securing bimetallism. We are pledged to do that, either in co-operation with other nations or else by United States legislation, whenever such safeguards can be adopted as will be reasonably certain to prevent breaking the parity between the two metals and giving us two kinds of dollars, one kind of less value than the other.

The question of the world's money of final redemption is not one of a day or a year or a decade, but of long periods of time. The mistake of several nations in or about 1873 cannot be rectified as the result of a wild commotion of the American people alone. It cannot be done by Bryan, Sewall, Altgeld, Tillman, George Fred. Williams, and their turbulent followers of to-day. It must be done by the judicious and persistent action of the conservative forces of society, the intelligent men of all parties co-operating in the adoption of a wise monetary system which shall correct the errors of the past, and base the money of the future upon foundations of justice to all classes of society.

It is the present opinion of the bimetallists of Europe that free silver coinage now by the United States alone would be an obstacle rather than a help to bimetallism. They say that silver monometallism is as bad as gold monometallism, and that progress toward the former is the destruction of the hopes of bimetallists. The friends of the double standard certainly ought to give heed to this general opinion of European bimetallists, and not rush recklessly into silver monometallism. England, it is true, nom-

inally insists that she will never give up the single gold standard, but her position will be a mere harmless theory provided she opens the mints of India to the coinage of silver, as she appears to be willing to do whenever the United States, France, and Germany are willing to arrange for the restoration of silver to unlimited coinage. The cause of bimetallism is not hopeless, but now stands still to await the result of the attempt of the Bryan and Altgeld Democracy to make the United States permanently a silver monometallic nation. Difficult as it will be to secure a hearing for these views during the coming canvass, it is from the standpoint of bimetallism that the fight against the Bryan candidacy should be made.

The issue, however, which I have admitted would be doubtful if simply and sharply defined as one between silver monometallism on the one side and either gold monometallism or bimetallism on the other, is not to be the whole issue. That may appear to be the issue in form. The real issue is substantially different. There is the added fact that the great mass of the careful, conservative, and prudent people of the country will be upon the side of McKinley, while practically all the Anarchists, Socialists, and destructives in society will rush to the support of Bryan. Mr. Bryan cannot reject these supporters, nor nullify the fatal effect of their friendship by disclaiming sympathy with their extreme views. Even if the Populists nominate a third ticket, it will be supported only by the harmless theorists of whom Senator Peffer is the leader and the idol. The real enemies of society, the men who arouse the mobs in our cities, and in order to remedy evils, sometimes fancied, sometimes real, would resist the officers of the law, destroy property, burn buildings, and commit homicides, will rush naturally to the support of the candidates nominated at Chicago. They cannot be shaken off. They will find in the platform much encouragement. They will find still more in a part of Mr. Bryan's speech made immediately after his nomination, in which he invites desperate people who want to repudiate their honest debts to give him their votes. He said :

"I once heard a story of a man at a hotel who could not sleep because the man in the room above walked the floor all night. At last the man below, in despair, asked his friend above why he continued to walk the floor throughout the night. The friend replied : 'I owe $10,000, and it is due next week. I think it is about time to walk the room all night.' 'But, my friend, why don't you go to sleep and let the other man do the walking?' "

In the platform an income tax is demanded, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court. It is not to be a just income tax, equal upon all property, except as to slight exemptions to help citizens to obtain the necessaries of life before paying a tax, but it is to be a graduated income tax, adopted with the unconcealed purpose of taxing great fortunes out of existence. If the Supreme Court continues to stand in the way, it is to be reconstructed by new laws and new appointments by President Bryan. Where so much is expressed the wild men of society will believe that much more is meant.

Therefore, apart from the language of the platform and the letters of acceptance of the candidates, the issue has inevitably made itself. It is between security to property and personal rights, and peaceful prosperity maintained by the friends of law and order, on the one side, and, on the other, Anarchy and Socialism, promoted by the advocates of public disorder and riotous violence as a means of redressing supposed grievances, who propose to convert our free, intelligent republic into a form of government as little swayed by reason and virtue as was the late Chicago mob, misnamed a Democratic Convention, which deliberately, in the year 1896, undertook to organize the solid South, with a few States of the West, to menace the property and prosperity of the North and East, by as wicked a movement as that after which it was deliberately patterned, the Southern rebellion of 1861.

The time of trial to the Republican party will come after its approaching victory. It will then be in order to determine whether it is the slave of the rich capitalists, of the promoters of trusts and monopolies, and of the bloated bondholders, as the Bryan Democrats (not the Sewall Democrats) and the Populists will contend. Its mission just now is to prevent repudiators, Anarchists, Socialists, and other enemies of organized society from achieving the first success in the work of tearing down the whole social fabric upon which rest the peace and prosperity of our country.

WM. E. CHANDLER.

II.

An Eastern Democrat, returning from witnessing the revolutionizing of the principles and of the control of his party at the Chicago Convention, unable to transform himself into an advo-

cate either of the free coinage of silver or of populism, and yet equally unable to give his support to Mr. McKinley and the Republican party, finds himself in a puzzling political predicament; if unwilling to bolt his party ticket, he yet cannot conscientiously advise others that the good of the country requires them to give their support to the principles embodied in his party platform. Standing in this attitude, the present writer will attempt in this article briefly to analyze the political causes of the extraordinary conditions within the Democratic party, and affecting it from the outside, which have now culminated in the Chicago platform and in the nomination of Mr. Bryan, and the prospects of the political success of the new departure.

Of course the situation as it appears now, immediately after the adjournment of the Convention, may be modified by the developments of the next few weeks, and may be entirely changed either way within the course of the next few months. No one can prophesy with any certainty the direction the popular mind will take in a political crisis such as is now upon the country. The most careful forecast of political probabilities may be entirely upset by a pronounced movement of public sentiment,—if it occurs not in the East only but throughout the country,—in one direction or the other. A strong and general movement in behalf of a bolting Democratic ticket, if a leader of standing accepted a position at its head, might, for instance, destroy Mr. Bryan's chances. All that will here be attempted, therefore, is some estimate of the case as it stands at the present moment. The great question is, what does this political revolution in the Democratic party signify? Whence has it come? Having swept that party off its feet in the nominating convention, is it going to revolutionize the political control of the country also at the polls?

One thing is clear; the time has gone by when the political movement for monetary reform, which has now expressed itself in the demand of the Chicago platform for the free, independent, and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, can be laughed out of court with mere ridicule, or killed by mere denunciation. Nothing is to be gained by simply shrieking "Populists, repudiators, and Anarchists" at those who have proved themselves numerous enough to exercise complete control over the present course of one of the great political parties

of the country. It is the duty of conservative men, even though they have shrunk from the idea of assuming any share of the responsibility for the Chicago platform, with its possibilities, at least, of immense disaster to the country, to endeavor to understand the spirit and purpose behind the radical political programme which has now been put forward, to appreciate the strength of the forces back of it, and especially to do whatever may be possible during the coming campaign to prevent political division from running on sectional or class lines.

In the first place, as to the presidential candidate of the Chicago Convention. However weak the nomination of Mr. Bryan might be under other conditions, or upon a different platform, there is every reason to believe that he is the best possible nominee for the Democratic party in its present situation, from the mere standpoint of success at the coming election. Candidate and platform are in complete accord. On such a radical platform there would have been no appreciable advantage in nominating a man of more conservative views and instincts. If success with such a programme be possible, it needs a man with the enthusiasm and audacity of youth to achieve it. Ordinarily, it would not be good policy for a great political party to nominate for the presidency, chiefly upon his ability as an orator, a man of Mr. Bryan's youth, comparative lack of experience in public affairs, and radicalism of views. But in the face of the present situation, the very boldness of the nomination gives it a certain strength. The exigency called for a candidate possessed of personal magnetism, able to give eloquent expression before a popular audience to the sentiments underlying the movement. The sort of warfare which may be expected from him may prove more effective than is now anticipated in some quarters. The instinct of the Convention in selecting the presidential nominee, for the first time in the history of American politics, from a State west of the Mississippi, was a sound one from the standpoint of political expediency. A Western candidate will win far more support in that section of the country than a Southern candidate could do, while he will probably hold the South about as well as a Southern man. Upon the platform adopted, the obvious policy of the party was to play for the Populist vote; to make an entirely new departure, creating a new party under an old name. The nomination of Mr. Bryan is more consistent with this policy than any

other which could have been made, unless indeed Senator Teller could have been taken up, and the unwisdom of nominating him was recognized by nearly everybody in the Convention. The past political course of the candidate commends him at least as much to Populists as to Democrats. Before these lines can be read the action of the Populist Convention at St. Louis will have been taken; the writer thinks it safe to assume that either Mr. Bryan will be endorsed, or that some arrangement will be made, then or later, by which he can secure the Populist votes.

The nomination of Mr. Sewall, of Maine, for Vice-President, while made in the Convention upon the spur of the moment, and chiefly for the purpose of avoiding possible mistakes in other directions, is mainly significant as indicating a desire to refute the idea that the new movement is a sectional one of the South and the farther West against the East; probably it was also intended to afford a conspicuous demonstration of the fact that every successful business man will not necessarily be opposed to the Democratic party in its new policy.

Looking first at the coming presidential contest merely from the standpoint of the popular vote, the one fact of prime significance, which must not be overlooked, is that 1,041,000 votes were cast in 1892 for Weaver, the Populist candidate for President, or nearly nineteen per cent. as many votes as were given to Cleveland. To be sure, this vote practically includes the whole Democratic vote in the States of Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, North Dakota, and Wyoming, where no Democratic electors were placed in nomination. Deducting a fair estimate of the Democratic vote in these States, the straight Populist vote still amounts to over 900,000, or over one-sixth of the vote cast for Cleveland.

Nor should it be forgotten, if we try to do justice to the political acumen of the new leaders, that owing to the irreconcilable conflict of opinion existing within the ranks of the Democratic party upon the money question, they were obliged to take one horn or the other of a dilemma. While free-silver coinage at 16 to 1 invited a formidable bolt on the part of Eastern Democrats, a great body of Democratic voters in the South and West were no longer willing to give their support to the party candidate unless upon a platform either declaring directly for free silver, or at least giving the certain assurance of financial legislation securing

an enlargement of the circulating medium of the country. The South had accepted the platform of 1892 partly because of the pronounced views of the candidate who was to stand upon it, partly because it specifically promised the repeal of the tax on state bank issues, partly because the currency plank could easily be construed to favor the free coinage of silver at a new ratio, in accordance with its market price. The failure of the Democratic party to support in Congress the repeal of the state bank tax, the construction placed by the administration upon the plank relating to silver, the repeal of the Sherman law without the enactment of any legislation in its place, and finally the issue of $262,000,000 of bonds, primarily and ostensibly for the purpose of purchasing gold to maintain the reserve of that metal, however commendable from the standpoint of Eastern sound-money men this course of action may have been, nevertheless led naturally and inevitably to the position assumed by the delegates of the South and West at Chicago. Their attitude there should have occasioned no surprise to any close observer of recent political tendencies.

In considering the readiness which the Southern Democrats have shown to accept the programme of a union with the Populists, with Mr. Bryan for the common candidate, it should be noted that the Populist party has shown strength enough to make it a factor in politics, on account of the size of its vote or of the closeness of the contest between the two old parties, in almost every State of the South. The Populist vote in Kentucky and Tennessee is so large that both of these States would probably be in doubt at the coming election upon a platform not in sympathy with Populist views. In Arkansas the Populist vote increased from 11,000 in 1892 to 24,000 in 1894; in Georgia, from 42,000 in the former year to 96,000, by means of fusion with the Republicans, in the latter. In North Carolina, Weaver's vote of 44,000 in 1892 became, through fusion with the Republicans, 148,000 in 1894, carrying the State. In Texas the Populist vote grew from 99,000 in 1892 to 159,000 in 1894; in Virginia, from 12,000 in the former year to 81,000 in 1893. In 1892 Weaver received 13,000 votes in Louisiana and 10,000 in Mississippi. At the State elections of 1894, the Populist vote in Alabama was 83,000, and in Missouri 42,000. A little consideration of these figures may enable Eastern men to

understand better the desire even of the leading politicians of the South to commit the Democratic party to a close alliance with Populism. The plain fact is that the South is honeycombed with Populism, and has been ready for a number of years for the formal alliance with the Populists beyond the Mississippi which has now been consummated at Chicago.

The South has given up, deliberately and probably for an indefinite period of time, its old political alliance in the Northeast, and has entered into a new alliance with the States beyond the Mississippi; it has exchanged the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, with their 52 doubtful or Democratic electoral votes, for the 83 electoral votes of the farther West, or such of them as it may be able to secure. Indiana, lying half way between the old political allies and the new ones, is doubtless expected by the South to enter into the new combination; but the chances that this State will remain Democratic on the new basis are hardly as good as was the prospect that she would continue Democratic in association with the Eastern States. The new lines of alliance also seek to include the great State of Illinois, and it now seems probable that the chances of placing her in the Democratic column as newly formed are better than the chances that she would have joined Indiana in her political course upon the old basis.

In the South itself the new alliance with Western Populism probably tends to hold Kentucky and Tennessee, which have been becoming doubtful States, more firmly in the Democratic column, to bring North Carolina back into the fold of Democracy, and to hold South Carolina within it, thus tending to make 43 electoral votes more secure for the Democratic party. It would certainly seem that this alliance will, on the other hand, tend to throw Delaware, Maryland, and probably West Virginia also, with their 17 electoral votes, into political affiliation with the North Atlantic States. However unwise future events may show this policy to be from a political standpoint, or however serious may be the results which the success of the new combination may bring to the country, there is certainly no great cause for surprise in the fact that it has commended itself from the standpoint of political expediency, or even necessity, to the judgment of old and tried Southern leaders, such as Senator Jones, of Arkansas.

The Chicago Convention furnished a striking demonstration of the fact that the centre of political power in this country has passed away from the East. The new conditions have already clearly manifested themselves in the Senate, though few have awakened to the permanent character of the change, or to the far-reaching influence upon the policies of the country which will inevitably result from it. The majority of the Senate, it must be remembered, can not only exert a considerable influence by its example over the House of Representatives, and through its power of confirmation of appointments over the President himself, but it has an absolute veto power over all legislation. However necessary financial legislation of some sort may be to secure the redeemability of all forms of our currency in gold, or even to protect the very solvency of the Treasury, no measure in this direction can become a law without the consent of a majority of the States of the Union, as represented in the Senate. One of the cardinal points of the present political situation is that the section of the country west of the Mississippi River, which for convenience will hereafter be referred to in this article as the West, has in recent years made an immense gain in votes in the Senate. By the admission since 1889 of the seven new States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah, having together fourteen votes, the sixteen votes which the West possessed before that year have been nearly doubled. The trans-Mississippi section now has just one-third of the total votes in the Senate; and even this representation will doubtless be increased in the near future by the admission of New Mexico and Arizona into the Union. The sixteen Southern States are represented by thirty-two Senators, so that the South and West together have to-day more than a two-thirds vote in the Senate. With the admission of two new Western States, the South could lose the political control entirely, as it has already lost it partly, of the three States of Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia, and yet, with the West, control just two-thirds of the Senate. It is, therefore, obvious that with any reasonable concert of action between the South and the West, these two sections of the country together can control the action of the Senate, and can thereby at least prevent the passage of any legislation not in harmony with the views of their people.

Nor can it be denied that this alliance has already plainly manifested itself in the Senate, and that the action of the Chicago Convention in coming out openly for the free coinage of silver, in espousing other political views of a Populistic character which are well regarded in the West, and finally in taking its Presidential nominee from a far Western State, has immensely strengthened the forces which tend to make the connection closer and more permanent.

If we turn to the votes in the Electoral College we find that the South, including Delaware with this section, has 159 votes, and the section west of the Mississippi 83, making a total of 242 votes, or 18 more than the 224 required to elect. Even though the States of Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia leave the Democratic column with their 17 electoral votes, as they are quite likely to do, a majority still remains; or if the South remains solid, Iowa and any one of ten other Western States might be lost without destroying the majority.

These figures are given not only on account of their bearing upon the coming political contest, but because they indicate also, however roughly, the strength of the alliance which has now been formed within the Democratic party. They are presented with a view to emphasizing the fact that in a presidential contest running upon the general lines which have now been laid down, the Democratic party need not carry a Northern State east of the Mississippi, if it can hold its lines even fairly intact in the South, and can secure nearly the whole of the electoral vote between the Mississippi and the Pacific Ocean. If the vote of either Illinois or Indiana can also be secured, to say nothing of Ohio, Michigan, or Wisconsin, it would make up for a very considerable defection in the far West or South.

Let us now take up the coming contest in view of these figures, and consider what light the recent course of each of the Western States throws upon its probable action at the coming election. The whole theory upon which the Democratic campaign of this year is based is that it is possible to effect a close union of the Democratic and Populist voters, if not a complete fusion of the two parties. If this can be secured without a bolt in the Western States of sound-money Democrats of such dimensions that it cannot be offset by the corresponding defection of silver Republicans which is likely to take place, the figures

certainly indicate that the Democratic ticket is likely to carry every State west of the Mississippi, unless it be Iowa.

Of these fifteen Western States, five, namely, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, North Dakota, and Nevada, were carried for the Populist electoral ticket in 1892, no Democratic electoral ticket being put in the field in the first four of these States. A union of the Democratic and Populist votes in the last presidential election would have carried seven more States, California by 25,000, Minnesota by 7,000, Montana by 6,000, Nebraska by 20,000, Oregon by 6,000, South Dakota by 1,000, Washington by 13,000. This leaves only the three States of Iowa, Wyoming, and Utah; Iowa was carried by the Republicans in 1892 over the combined vote of the Democrats and Populists only by 4,000, and Wyoming went for Harrison over Weaver by only 700 plurality. In 1895 the new State of Utah went Republican in a gubernatorial election by 2,000 plurality; but the division of the Republican party in that State, as evidenced by the bolt of one of its Senators from the St. Louis Convention, and the strong silver sentiment prevailing there, will doubtless make it Democratic at the coming election.

In view of these figures, and of the well-known and pronounced attitude of a majority of the people of the West not only upon silver, but upon other issues embodied in the Democratic platform of this year, there is certainly a strong basis for the assumption that all of the electoral votes of the West, except those of Iowa, will be cast for Bryan. Without obtaining the vote of any Northern State east of the Mississippi, he could afford to lose Iowa and Delaware, or if he could capture the votes of Iowa he could lose those of Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia.

But it will be claimed upon the other side that Kentucky, and possibly Tennessee as well, may go for McKinley, and thus make such a large breach in the vote of the solid South that it cannot be compensated for in the West. It is doubtless true that the former, perhaps the latter also, of these States will be strongly contested by the Republican managers; if the state of public opinion is such that either or both of them can be detached from the Democratic side, it will doubtless indicate the existence of conditions fatal to Bryan's prospects of success. But let us look at the figures in these two States. It is true that sound-money Democrats are both numerous and influential in

Kentucky, and the government of the State is at present in the hands of the Republican party. But it is probable that the great body of sound-money Democrats who would be willing to go to the length of bolting their party ticket in a presidential election refrained from voting for the last Democratic candidate for Governor, and that this led to the election of the Republican candidate by the 9,000 plurality which he received ; on the other hand, there were 17,000 votes cast by the Populists at the last election for their nominee for Governor, leaving the Republican party 8,000 votes short of a majority. In 1892 the combined vote for Cleveland and for Weaver exceeded the vote for Harrison by 63,000 ; on this basis 30,000 sound-money Democrats could vote for Mr. McKinley without losing the State for Bryan. Taking into account the strength of the Kentucky brand of Democracy in a presidential contest, it seems unlikely that the electoral vote of the State will go to McKinley, in spite of the attitude of leading Democratic papers.

In Tennessee the case is very much the same, except that the Republican prospects are not so good. In 1892 the Democratic plurality was 38,000, while the Populist ticket received 23,000 votes. On a total vote for Governor in 1894 considerably less than that of 1892, the State was, to be sure, evenly divided ; but if the Populists had voted for the Democratic candidate instead of for their own, the former would have had a plurality of 23,000.

In regard to Maryland, Delaware, and West Virginia, the recent political course of these States, and the strength in all of them of the commercial interests which will be strongly enlisted on the Republican side, together with the strength of the sound-money Democrats in the first two of them, makes it likely that their votes will be found in the Republican column. The Democratic party of Maryland is badly divided by internal dissensions, and the fact that the Republicans carried the State in 1895 by a majority of 18,000, on a total vote 27,000 larger than the presidential vote of 1892, would seem to indicate that the McKinley managers may reasonably hope to secure its electoral vote. Delaware only went for Cleveland by 500 plurality in 1892, and elected a Republican Governor in 1894. Unless the factional quarrel in the Republican party prevents that result, the vote of the State will doubtless be given to McKinley. West Virginia is normally a very close State, and the fact that her vote has been decidedly

Republican of late, taken in connection with the strength of the financial interests behind McKinley, may well carry the State for him.

Before passing from the South a word should be said as to North Carolina. The Populists have recently outnumbered either the Democrats or the Republicans in this State, and it has recently been controlled by a Republican-Populist fusion. Under other conditions the vote of the State would have been uncertain; but it is doubtless safe for Mr. Bryan on a free-coinage platform.

Let us now consider the possibility of votes for the Democratic ticket in the central section of the country east of the Mississippi. Here we find the doubtful State of Indiana, whose vote has been given to the Democratic party in three of the five last presidential elections, and the State of Illinois, formerly safely Republican, but now placed by her recent political action in the list of uncertain States. These two States will be the real pivotal ones in the coming campaign. If Bryan can carry either of them, the figures above given would seem to indicate that he will in all probability be elected; if, on the other hand, they are both carried for McKinley, the chances would seem to be against Bryan's success, although, as above indicated, he might possibly still succeed in securing an election by receiving the nearly solid electoral votes of the South, and of the farther West. If the Democratic candidate can carry the 24 electoral votes of Illinois, he can lose Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia in the South, and Iowa and any other single State in the West, or three or four of those with the smallest population, and still carry the election. If he can secure the 15 electoral votes of Indiana, without Illinois, he can afford to lose the three first-named States, together with Iowa and any one of the six Western States having three electoral votes each.

In 1892 Illinois went for Cleveland by 27,000, and the vote for Weaver was 22,000. In 1894 the Populist vote for Treasurer had risen to 60,000. Political conditions in this State are in a chaotic condition, and the only thing that can be said at this writing with any degree of certainty is that the vote would be uncertain if the election were held to-morrow, according to the best information obtainable. It is an open question whether Gov. Altgeld's interest in the national campaign will not be a source of strength rather than of weakness on the Democratic

side. Nearly all of the men of conservative opinions who would be repelled from the national ticket by his active support of it are opposed to it in any case on account of the platform. It must be admitted, upon the other hand, however much people in the East may dislike Gov. Altgeld's opinions and actions, that he has shown no mean powers as a political leader, and that he has a large following outside of party lines among the laboring men of the State. He is thoroughly familiar with the politics of the State, and with the methods of campaigning likely to prove most effective; and if he throws himself heartily into the fight for Bryan, as he will doubtless do, particularly as his own re-election is at stake, it will have no small influence upon the result. The fact that the Republican nominee for Governor is admitted by his own party friends to be a very weak candidate, the strength which free silver has had for many years in the country districts of the State, and the great size of the agricultural vote, Illinois having no less than 240,000 farms, further tend to make the result uncertain. The bolt of the sound-money Democrats, either to McKinley or to a third candidate, will of course be a large one, but other factors in the situation may overcome even this defection. Chicago in the coming contest, even if the Democratic national headquarters are not located in that city, as they logically should be, will hold exactly the same position as the centre of the fight which New York city has occupied in so many past elections, and Illinois, the Empire State of the Middle West, will take the place so long occupied by the State of New York as the pivot upon which the contest will turn.

The chances that Indiana will be carried by Bryan do not seem to be so good, in spite of the fact that this State has a much longer Democratic record than Illinois. If the tide sets strongly among the farmers in favor of free silver, Indiana may easily be carried by him, but if the coming campaign resembles those of the past in this State, the amount of money which the Republicans can and will spend to carry it for McKinley, with the moderate supply of campaign funds likely to be found on the Democratic side, may reasonably be expected to result in Republican success.

In the foregoing article, the writer has endeavored briefly to indicate a few of the reasons which seem to him to render the success of the Chicago ticket at least neither impossible nor

highly improbable. The average business man of the East is too likely to argue that no programme such as that which has now been adopted by the Democratic party, can possibly receive the endorsement of the people at the polls. If the sound-money sentiment of the whole country is as strong as he assumes it to be, such will doubtless prove to be the case; but it should be remembered that there are a large number of voters who are thoroughly tired of the old political parties and of the leadership which has controlled them, and that before the campaign is over they may be strongly attracted by the prospect of bringing about political disruption through the election of Mr. Bryan. A few months ago, the voters whose first desire was to bring about a change in the policies of the Federal Government were nearly all drifting to the Republican side; but the Democratic party has now cut itself loose so entirely from the present administration and from existing political conditions, that it offers to the country a much more pronounced change than the Republican party. The latter now stands as the champion of the "existing gold standard" and the present financial order, while the former offers a programme of radical and far-reaching change. With the old political fences so completely down, and in the face of conditions so chaotic, there is no warrant for any assurance as to the result of the election in November.

JOSIAH QUINCY.

SOME ANTE-BELLUM POLITICS.

BY THE HON. GEORGE W. JULIAN.

THE pending struggle for the Presidency not only brings with it the customary revival of interest in public questions, but it recalls the campaigns of earlier times which played their part in shaping the politics of to-day. To some of these I propose to refer by way of personal reminiscence, and in order to represent them intelligibly to the present generation, and indicate the lessons which they teach, I shall restate the essential facts and conditions which preceded them and inspired their operations. To-day is the child of yesterday, and whoever would profit by the past must ponder its teachings.

The campaign of 1840 stands by itself in the history of American politics. It had no precedent; and it can never be repeated, because the conditions which made it possible can never be reproduced. No one has adequately described it. The Whigs tendered no defined issues, and, in fact, practically surrendered both their principles and their party identity for the sake of success. General Harrison was a strict-construction Democrat of the straightest sect. He boasted on the stump that he belonged to the school of Jefferson, Mason, and Henry; but, unlike these great men, he believed in negro slavery, and had labored with all his might to introduce it in Indiana, and thus fasten it upon the Northwest. But he was a man of revolutionary blood, and the hero of Tippecanoe. His champions also paraded him as a farmer, and a poor man who lived in a log cabin and drank hard cider; while Van Buren was painted as a ruffle-shirted aristocrat who took his soup from a gold spoon, and was trying to unite the sword and the purse of the nation in his unhallowed clutches. The campaign opened in a memorable crisis of "hard times" and financial troubles, but the promised Whig blessing of "two dol-

lars a day and roast beef" which would certainly follow Harrison's election, and the child-like faith that all wrongs would be righted by a mere change of administration, made the Whig masses supremely happy. They seemed to be riding on a great tidal wave of "joy unspeakable," which swept everything before it. The canvass became a stupendous political frolic. Whiggery was translated into a shout, and the Democrats were silenced by acclamation. They were amazed and dumfounded beyond expression, but their solemn faces only added to the general mirth of the Whigs. The campaign was set to music, and it poured itself forth in doggerel rhymes of every conceivable quality and meter, which perfectly voiced the abounding fun and buffoonery of the hour. The stump speech was entirely subordinated to the song. Monster meetings of the people were the order of the day, and they came together as if by spontaneous impulse. There were cavalcades, military parades, barbecues, processions of log cabins and canoes on wheels, hard cider, and raccoons in abundance, and such an infinite variety of comic and grotesque exhibitions as only the genius of such a campaign could suggest.

Such was this most remarkable of all our presidential struggles. It was the farthest thing possible from a campaign of education, for its management plainly assumed that political knowledge was not wanted and would even be an obstacle to success. But it brought with it two important lessons. In the first place, the election returns disclosed the surprising fact that in the midst of this political whirlwind men were pondering the most serious question that ever made its appeal to the American people, and that over seven thousand of them had cast their votes for James G. Birney, the first anti-slavery candidate for the Presidency. This was the first instalment of that organized political action which culminated in the election of Lincoln and the final overthrow of slavery. In the second place, we see clearly that while Harrison's triumph was overwhelming, his death one month after his inauguration and the succession of John Tyler only precipitated the Whig catastrophe which was made inevitable by a campaign in which principles were given to the winds, and availability was made the sole basis of action and bond of union. These valuable lessons should be accepted as some atonement for the folly and mischief of the great hard-cider inundation.

The campaign of 1844 was totally different. In the Demo-

cratic National Convention of May 27, Van Buren was thrown overboard because of his opposition to the immediate annexation of Texas, and James K. Polk nominated as the special champion of that idea. Van Buren, then so well known throughout the country as "a Northern man with Southern principles," now demonstrated that not even so great a temptation as the Presidency, which was placed conditionally within his grasp, could swerve him from his convictions of public duty. The Whigs had had enough of the racket and nonsense of 1840. Sobered and chastened by their folly, their National Convention of May 1 unanimously nominated Henry Clay as their standard-bearer. This left no doubt about the issues, for Clay was everywhere regarded as "the embodiment of Whig principles." On the burning question of annexation he was unequivocally committed. He declared that annexation would be followed by war with Mexico, while all parties saw that it would bring into the Union a large area of slave territory, and thus powerfully strengthen the growing ascendancy of slavery over the national government. The issues of the canvass were vital, for they involved the fortunes of the Republic, as now clearly seen in the light of subsequent events. Clay had now reached the age of sixty-seven, but he was in the full possession of his powers, with the added charms of ripeness and dignity, with which time had touched and beautified his commanding personality. I had read his speeches from my boyhood, and had met him and heard him speak two years before, when he visited Indiana. As one of his young disciples, and a member of the great brotherhood of his political idolators, I entered the canvass and made my first stump speeches, which, in their spirit and substance, were similar to those which I made four years later as a Free Soil leader. The confidence of the Whigs in Clay's triumph was unbounded. Now, at last, they felt sure that the opportunity had come to crown their great chief with the honor he had so long coveted. This confidence seemed to be justified by facts. The nomination of so small and obscure a competitor as Polk was laughed at by the Whigs, and the Democrats themselves seemed at first a little depressed. The Whig tariff of 1842 was very popular, and Clay was in the noon-day of his fame. Webster was not now on the presidential anxious seat, and cordially supported the ticket; and, in fact, there seemed to be a jubilant unanimity of feeling

in the party which gave promise of a rousing victory. And this was no transient feeling. It sustained the Whigs till the last moment of the canvass. Indeed, Clay himself, in common with his friends, believed he was victorious till the evening of the day following the election. Nothing could shake their faith. The Democrats early in the struggle rallied from their temporary apathy, and gave their united and enthusiastic efforts to Polk; but this did not disturb the Whigs, whose courage and faith never faltered. The fight was a grand one, and it was for principles. The great leaders of both parties entered the field. It was a battle between giants. In every respect it contrasted splendidly with the campaign for "Tippecanoe and Tyler too." But the fates, as usual, were against the Whigs. In Louisiana, the Plaquemine election frauds gave that State to Polk. The unfortunate outbreak of Nativism in our chief cities proved disastrous to the Whigs. Polk's Kane letter, committing himself to the policy of a revenue tariff with incidental protection, which was translated into "Polk, Dallas, and the Tariff of 1842," and emblazoned on the Democratic banners, took Pennsylvania from Clay and gave it to Polk. And the seven thousand votes for Birney in 1840 were now swelled to over sixty-two thousand, of which enough in the State of New York alone were withheld from Clay, on account of his vacillating letters on the question of annexation, to give that State to Polk. Thus faded away the fond hopes and intoxicating dreams of a great Whig victory.

When the returns at last made it certain that the "obscure Tennesseean" had triumphed, the disappointment and humiliation of Clay's friends became unutterable. I have known nothing like it in the history of politics. In my own immediate neighborhood, I found prominent Whigs so prostrated by the defeat that they took to their beds and could neither eat nor sleep for days and nights in succession. Kindred experiences must have been innumerable. The sorrow of the Whigs was not merely heartfelt but heart-rending. To them all the joy of life seemed to have fled, and they utterly refused to be comforted. They felt that an overwhelming preponderance of the virtue and intelligence of the country stood behind Clay, while the larger element of ignorance and "unwashed" humanity, including Southern fire-eaters, slavery extensionists, nullifiers, and the vicious and criminal classes in all the great cities, had voted him down. They believed

that no statesman of eminence could ever be made President, and their faith in free government for the time completely gave way; while Clay himself was overwhelmed by letters of condolence, which poured in upon him from every section of the Union, and thus gave a keener edge to his disappointment.

But the defeat of Clay was by no means a national calamity. Texas was annexed before Polk came into power, and it would have been annexed at no distant day if Clay had been elected. The poison of slavery had so entered into the life of the people, and the habit of submission to its demands had become so confirmed, that the triumph of Polk and immediate annexation only quickened the inevitable march of events. It was simply an incident of the great conflict which was to be decided at last by the ordeal of battle.

The campaign of 1848 was largely shaped and inspired by the great historic events which preceded it. The Mexican war, which logically followed the annexation of Texas, had added California and New Mexico to our national territory, and the evident purpose of the South to spread slavery over these regions quite naturally gave birth to the Wilmot Proviso, or the Congressional prohibition of slavery therein. Both the Whigs and Democrats of the Northern States were in favor of this proviso, but they wavered and faltered because their brethren in the South were against it, and the party harmony was thus endangered. This led to the formation of the Free Soil Party, which was the first formidable attempt to carry the slavery question into politics. It was a tremendous venture, and had no justification in any calculations of profit and loss. It was an open defiance of public opinion, and an insurrection against the long-established and growing power of the South. It was a declaration of war against the Whig and Democratic parties, which had become the bulwarks of slavery, and it could not fail to arouse a powerful and embittered hostility.

The Democratic National Convention met on the 22d of May, and Lewis Cass was nominated. He had been the zealous champion of the Wilmot Proviso the year before, but he now favored the policy of popular sovereignty in the Territories, as expounded in his famous Nicholson letter. It was not all that the South wanted, but with General Cass as its practical interpreter, it was accepted as a provisional policy.

The Whig National Convention met on the 7th of June. The defeat of Clay in 1844 had demoralized the party, and it was now ready for another investment in the folly of availability. Remembering its success with General Harrison, the Convention nominated General Taylor, who had never been known as a Whig, and had never cast a vote. The Whigs had always denounced the war with Mexico as a war of conquest unconstitutionally begun by President Polk; but they now made the hero of this war their standard-bearer as their chosen means of political success. The Whigs of the free States professed to favor the Wilmot Proviso; but their nominee was a large Louisiana slave-owner, who was entirely acceptable to the South, and in whose hands, according to every reasonable presumption, the interests of the South would be perfectly safe. As if to demonstrate all this, the Convention contemptuously voted down the Wilmot Proviso, the result of which was the immediate desertion of many thousands of Whigs, and the final dissolution of the party.

The Free Soil National Convention met at Buffalo on the 9th of August. It was an immense mass convention, called together for the purpose of organizing a new party, and composed of elements that had never before acted together; but their enthusiasm was unbounded. The movement represented the Whigs of the Northern States, who were dissatisfied with the nomination of General Taylor and the repudiation of the Wilmot Proviso; the Democrats who could not support General Cass since his change of base as proclaimed in his Nicholson letter, and who longed for the opportunity to rebuke their party for its treatment of Van Buren four years before; and the Liberty Party, which was now ready to disband and affiliate with a larger movement committed to its essential doctrines. An admirable platform of principles was agreed upon, and the somewhat discordant elements finally harmonized by the nomination of Martin Van Buren for President and Charles Francis Adams for Vice-President. The campaign opened with the watchwords, "Van Buren and Free Soil, Adams and Liberty," and the contest was bitter and remorseless beyond all precedent. It is impossible now to conceive the immeasurable wrath and scorn which were lavished upon the men who deserted the old parties. The fight became ferocious, and the warfare between the Whigs and Free Soilers in the West was only matched by that of the Barnburners

and Old Hunkers in New York. Among the great Free Soil leaders in that State, John Van Buren, or "Prince John" as he was then named by common consent, was the "bright particular star." He was tall, graceful, and commanding. As a stump speaker he was a genius. His power over a great audience was phenomenal. Men of all shades of opinion were drawn to him by the indescribable charm of his personality. In repelling the savage assaults of the Hunker Democracy his thrusts were sometimes terrific, of which a striking example was given the year before, in meeting the brutal attacks of the pro-slavery press upon Silas Wright. An Albany journal completely outdid all its rivals in an atrocious assault written just after his sudden death, and without any knowledge of the fact. Referring to this, Van Buren said: "The blow which was aimed at the living statesman fell upon his new-made grave, and by an inscrutable providence his assassin was transformed into a jackal."

The effects of this campaign were most remarkable, and they show the power of a small and hated party to accomplish great and far-reaching results. General Taylor was elected, but his triumph proved the death of the Whig party. The long-coveted prize of the Presidency was snatched from General Cass, and the Democratic party was divided and humiliated by the struggle to serve two masters, while the friends of Van Buren had their longed-for revenge. The Free Soil ticket failed to carry the electoral vote of a single State, but the movement placed Chase in the United States Senate from Ohio, and sent to the lower branch of Congress a sufficient number of anti-slavery men to hold the balance of power in that body. It saved Oregon from the curse of slavery, with a territory nearly equal to that of the original thirteen States. It took the lead in the work of dedicating the public lands to actual settlement, which was finally consummated in 1862, and in compelling the admission of California into the Union as a free State; while it was the prophecy and parent of the larger movement which triumphed in 1860, and crowned itself with glory in suppressing the rebellion and giving freedom to the slave. These were great and magnificent achievements; and yet the members of the little party which stood behind them were then branded as fanatics for throwing away their votes!

But in awarding these honors to the Free Soil party, it should be frankly admitted that its leaders unwittingly did General Tay-

lor a great injustice in this campaign. His administration was not the hand-maid of slavery, nor was he the tool of any party or faction. Early in his official life he disclosed the fact that he had a mind of his own, and that the rule of his life was fidelity to his convictions. He set his face like flint against Clay's scheme of compromise, and confronted the great leaders of both parties, including his own son-in-law, Jefferson Davis, in maintaining his position. Taylor's plan of settlement in 1850 looked to the early admission of California and New Mexico as States, without executive or congressional intermeddling with their fortunes. He believed this policy would settle their condition in the interest of freedom. He thought California should be admitted at once, on its own merits, without being loaded down with a Texas boundary bill, a new fugitive-slave law, or any other legislative incumbrance. All attempts to intimidate or browbeat him were utterly vain, and when he suddenly died, in the summer of 1850, "Clay's Omnibus," as Professor Von Holst declares, "was left sticking in a swamp," where in all probability it would have remained if Taylor had lived, for he "never surrendered." The Free Soil members of Congress who had zealously opposed his election had become his best friends, and they were as gratified to find this Louisiana planter on the side of freedom and free labor as they were mortified after his death to find Fillmore, who had been elected as a Wilmot Proviso Whig from New York, takthe place of his predecessor and repudiating the liberal policy to which he had been so passionately devoted.

The campaign of 1852 is made memorable by the platforms then adopted by both the great parties. These platforms were the outcome of Clay's famous compromise of 1850, which abandoned the Wilmot Proviso and provided for the admission of additional States, with or without slavery, as their people might determine; enacted anew and very exasperating fugitive-slave law; extended the boundaries of Texas so as to add a vast area of free soil to slavery, and gave her ten millions of dollars besides; and enacted a law which pretended to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia, but did not. In the light of antecedent facts it is not surprising that these enactments were accepted by both parties as a "final settlement" of the slavery question. As to the Democrats, their experience in 1848 with General Cass and his Nicholson letter had convinced them that nothing was to

be gained by mincing matters, and that a hearty, complete, and unhesitating surrender to the demands of their Southern brethren was the surest means of success. Accordingly, in their National Convention of the first of June, which nominated Pierce and King, they declared the fugitive-slave law to be equally sacred with the Constitution, and pledged the party to "resist all attempts at renewing in Congress, or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." It was just as natural for the Whigs, after their surrender in 1848, to follow this example in their National Convention of the 16th of June, which nominated Scott and Graham. They accordingly expressed their acquiescence in the compromise acts of 1850 "as a final settlement, in principle and substance, of the subjects to which they relate"; and they deprecated "all further agitation of the questions thus settled as dangerous to our peace," and pledged the party "to discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever, or however made." Here, indeed, was a real novelty in our politics. The sole issue in this campaign was slavery, and on this the rival parties were perfectly agreed. Their only strife was for the offices, and to this end each did its best to outdo the other in solemn asseverations of loyalty to the South. Both were not only willing, but anxious, to surrender the constitutional right of free speech in furtherance of party success, and this they proposed to do by reviving and applying to the whole people of the United States the gag rule of Atherton, of New Hampshire, which had been abrogated after a struggle of ten years under the heroic leadership of John Quincy Adams. The folly of this action is only equalled by its enormity, but its logic was unanswerable. If slavery was to be taken entirely out of politics and placed beyond the power of legislation it could only be done by totally suppressing free discussion. No wrong under the sun is secure while the right is regarded as sacred, and no one saw this more clearly than John C. Calhoun and his disciples. But they knew that it was as impossible to suppress the freedom of speech as to imprison the winds or stay the tides of the sea. The attempt of the Whigs and Democrats to do this was as futile as the Pope's bull against the comet, or Mrs. Partington's broom in mopping out the Atlantic. When these platforms were made *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was reaching the hearts of

millions on both sides of the Atlantic, and playing its part in creating that public opinion of the civilized world which clearly foreshadowed the downfall of slavery. The tide of anti-slavery agitation was then nearing its flood, as shown by the numerous publications called forth by Mrs. Stowe's book, and the astonishing circulation of Sumner's great speech on the fugitive slave law. Agitation pervaded the common air. It found its way to the fireside and the social circle. It met the people at every turn. The very measures which the party platforms pronounced a finality gave it a sort of omnipresence, while the agitation of the party leaders themselves to *prevent* agitation only made still more ridiculous their attempt to silence it. And its suppression, if it had been possible, would have given us an absolute despotism in exchange for our free system of government.

In the light of to-day it seems utterly incredible that the events of this campaign could ever have happened. The conscience of the nation then touched its lowest point in the history of the Republic, if it did not reach the dead line; but many eminent men who in later years have rendered great and patriotic service to the country joined hands in this work of national humiliation. Mr. Seward scouted the idea of doing anything for the cause of freedom except through the Whig party, which in this very campaign dug the grave in which it was soon afterwards buried. Abraham Lincoln, who only six years later in his famous debate with Douglas, talked so eloquently about "a government half slave and half free," took the field on the platform which commanded silence on the only living issue of the time. All the great party leaders on both sides united in this unhallowed attempt to pacify their Southern brethren and eternize slavery, because their eyes were not yet anointed and they saw men as trees walking. But "the day is darkest before the dawn." Partly through the reaction which inevitably followed the madness of their measures, and partly through the teaching of events, the national conscience was resurrected, and a new heavens and a new earth appeared. Let no man despair of the Republic after such a trial and such a triumph.

The canvass of the Whigs in this struggle was utterly without heart or enthusiasm. Some of the Southern Whigs distrusted General Scott, while several of the Northern Whig leaders made themselves the laughing-stock of the country by their policy

of "spitting upon the platform and swallowing the man who stood upon it." The Democrats were united. Notwithstanding their monstrous platform they succeeded in persuading the leading Barnburners of 1848 to return to the party and muster again in the army of slavery. General Dix, the Van Burens, David Dudley Field, Samuel J. Tilden, and one hundred thousand others in the State of New York alone, who had supported the Free Soil ticket of 1848, were now fighting for Pierce. They were not Free Soil men, but Van Buren men, who had been fighting for "liberty and revenge."

The Free Soil National Convention met at Pittsburgh on August 11, and nominated Hale and Julian. They adopted substantially the platform of 1848, with a few important additions. The party was then known as the Free Democracy, and the Convention declared that it was "not organized to aid either the Whig or Democratic wing of the great slave-compromise party of the nation, but to defeat them both ; and that, repudiating and renouncing both as hopelessly corrupt and utterly unworthy of confidence, the purpose of the Free Democracy is to take possession of the Federal government and administer it for the rights and interests of the whole people."

The real enthusiasm of the campaign was in their ranks. They had no dream of success or even of carrying a single electoral vote ; but they were profoundly in earnest, and united as one man. They really enjoyed the campaign, notwitstanding the smallness of their number, and the great odds against them. They had the courage of their opinions, and were animated by the enthusiasm of a great cause. The result of the canvass was a surprise to all parties. Pierce received 254 electoral votes, and Scott but 42, representing only four States of the Union. Hale received a little more than 156,000 votes, so that nineteen-twentieths of the voters of the United States in 1852, only a little more than ten years before Lincoln's preliminary proclamation of emancipation, voted for the finality and sacredness of the surrender made by Congress in 1850, and for the suppression of the freedom of speech as a means to that end ; while only one-twentieth had the courage to claim their souls as their own. These were disheartening facts after a quarter of a century of anti-slavery agitation ; for the deluded masses, who had been moulded and kneaded by the plastic touch of the South into such unworthy

uses were the only possible material from which recruits could be drawn for a great party of the future, which should regenerate our politics and re-enthrone the love of liberty. But the members of the little party never lost their faith. The mercenary and trading element, which had acted with them in 1848, was now eliminated, and no better or purer political organization ever existed. Its members felt perfectly sure of their triumph, because they knew that the unjust thing shall not prosper. And they made good their purpose to "take possession of the Federal government and administer it for the rights and interests of the whole people," for they were the nucleus and inspiration of the great movement which finally accomplished the work.

Of the Free Soil leaders of national repute in 1848 and 1852, one only survives. The names of these men, so familar to the public in their generation, are now rarely mentioned, but what they wrought endures. The question which so stirred their blood and kindled the wrath of their opponents has been lifted out of the tangle and jargon of debate into the clear light of accomplished facts. This is their sufficient reward, and will be their enduring renown. The lesson of their struggle and triumph is the inestimable value of political courage. They planted their feet upon the rock of principle and bided their time. If they had taken counsel of their fears and faltered in the face of a powerful and intolerant opposition, a divided union or a slave empire would have been the result. The same political courage is needed in dealing with the foreign and domestic policy of the government to-day, while the lack of it has brought upon the country its prolonged financial troubles and made the people afraid of their rulers. History is repeating itself. The present state of our politics recalls the tactics of 1852. Nothing is more to be deplored than the statesmanship which employs its time in finding out which way the wind blows and trimming its sails accordingly, instead of bravely appealing to fundamental principles as its never-failing guide.

GEORGE W. JULIAN.

CAN THE CRIMINAL BE RECLAIMED?

BY DR. H. S. WILLIAMS.

PROMINENT among the new "sciences" that have sprung up, mushroom-like, in our generation is "criminology." Its advocates regard the criminal as a distinct type of the *genus homo*. With the true spirit of our induction-haunted age, they analyze the delinquent out of all association with his fellows, making him stand apart as a separate order of being. This established to their own satisfaction, they are now searching for lesser subdivisions within the order. And so far has this analysis proceeded that already the criminologist is able to point out typical "murderers" who have never been accused of even attempting homicide, thus dividing the honors as to feats of classification with those other workers who some time since told us of typical "inebriates" who had never been intoxicated. The gist of the matter is that if your subject has the head and form of a certain mould he is a typical murderer potentially; whether he chances ever to live up to his potentialities is a matter of little moment. No doubt the abstract robber, forger, and what not, will follow in due season.

All this is very delightful if true. It suggests visions of a golden age, when science shall rule society and by its anticipatory action nip all crimes in the bud by restraining their would-be perpetrators. But with the vision comes also a doubt. One cannot help asking himself if the riddle of life is really so near a definite solution as all this would imply. Is the human mind so unified and invariable an entity that the initiated may read it as an open book; may not only interpret its present state but predict its future? One who looks into his own mind and sees what turmoil of tendencies is there would scarce have thought to read so tangibly the mind of another.

The matter becomes still more puzzling if we consider the question, What is a crime? For reflection seems to show that crime is not a thing *sui generis*, but merely the expression of a relation; the factors being on the one hand a certain human action, on the other a vague average status of human action at a given stage of evolution. A certain set of movements constituted the criminal act, but there was nothing intrinsically wrong in the movements. The act itself may not have been inherently wrong. It is the relation of that act to the rights of some other individual, directly or indirectly, that gave the stamp of criminality. Two persons are as essential to a crime as to a quarrel. Acts that militate against the interest of the agent only are called vices, not crimes. Again, deeds stamped as criminal under some circumstances are justified under others. Time was when might made right in the eyes of the most enlightened. Outrageous deeds had sanction of custom and the law among our primitive ancestors. And even now the outrage need only be done on a large enough scale to escape criticism. A highly civilized nation, acting as a unit, may swoop down upon a lesser nation and absorb it against its will without receiving the brand of robber. The deeds of individuals, too, are judged by a sliding scale. Many a man enjoys in honored security a fortune obtained by such means as would have gained him a home in the penitentiary had he taken hundreds instead of millions. Even so unequivocal a deed as the taking of human life is not intrinsically criminal according to our most advanced standards of thought. The soldier in battle has the lust of a veritable murderer, yet we do not call him by that name. And, under conditions of ordinary living, a man may take the life of another in self-defense and be held guiltless. Nor is accidental homicide, unless contributary carelessness is shown, regarded as a crime.

This last illustration suggests that even a consideration of a deed in its relations to the victim is not in itself enough to establish the ethical status of the deed. We must go a step further and inquire why the deed was committed. Unless the perpetrator of the deed acted intentionally, he is at most guilty of criminal carelessness. The assumption is that man is a rational animal; that there is a purpose—a desire—back of his every action. We hold him responsible only so long as he lives up to this assumption. The most ardent criminologist would not, I presume, as-

sert that his most typical criminal commits crime without a motive.

At this stage of the analysis, then, a crime would appear to be a deed by which one person expects to gain personal benefit at the expense of another person or persons. But the slightest reflection shows that this formula is not exact. It is inclusive, but it is not exclusive. The expectation of personal benefit is the great ruling motive back of nearly every human action; indeed it is in the last analysis the sole fundamental motive to action in the organic world. Hence there is nothing unique or characteristic in this feature of the criminal action, by itself. And undoubtedly a large number of human actions that are considered legitimate and not criminal benefit the actor at the expense of his fellows. For example, the speculations by which most of the large fortunes of civilized countries are made belong largely to this category. Evidently some element that enters into the essential nature of a crime has yet escaped us. And this essential element is the consideration of the kind or degree of injury that is inflicted on the victim of the crime. The words crime and sin are not synonymous. Sinfulness is fixed in accordance with an absolute standard of ethics, criminality in accordance with a relative or human standard. And as the social organism is steadily evolving, its standard of ethics is constantly changing; hence the boundaries of criminal action are forever fluctuating. An accurate descriptive definition of crime therefore becomes impossible. We may modify the partial definition already given by saying that a crime is an act by which one person expects to gain personal benefit at such expense to another person or persons as society at the moment considers inequitable. But this is only a circumlocution of that practical definition of crime as a wilful violation of human law, which proposition is perhaps as near a satisfactory definition as we can hope to come to. If we understand that the laws in question have been framed to represent the average ethical standards of the social organism at a given time, this definition is sufficiently comprehensive.

In view of the fact that we have seen the motive to crime to be a natural and rational one, the essential question in reference to the causation of crime is not why some persons commit crimes, but why all persons do not commit crimes. It is a matter of common experience that every one has desires that if carried out

would criminally infringe the rights of others. Why are such desires in any given case repressed? There can be but one reason: these desires are subordinated and overcome by other antagonistic desires. Desire is the motive power back of all human action; and most complicated actions are brought about only after a variety of conflicting desires have been weighed and considered. The higher desires which, being weighed and considered, overcome our criminal desires, are the outgrowth of the gregarious habits of our race. So long as each family existed by and for itself alone, the ethics of pure egoism must have prevailed. But when the desirability of communal life for mutual protection, and of division of labor for mutual advantage, had become apparent, it must have been equally apparent that these things were not compatible with pure egoism. The spirit of practical altruism was born, and the cornerstone of civilization was laid. But this altruistic spirit merely meant, after all, that each individual would consult his own ultimate interest if he sometimes put aside his immediate desires in favor of the desires of others. For example, the barbarian starting out on a hunting expedition sees a very fine bow hanging in front of his neighbor's tent, and strongly desires to possess it. He starts to take it; but at once reflects that by so doing he will incur the wrath of the neighbor, who will come forth and in all probability kill him. He desires to live more than to possess the bow; so the immediate desire is put aside. Such acts of self-denial, being manifestly in the interests of communal advancement, come finally to have the sanction of the race; they are then said to be right, the opposite acts to be wrong. In time, another motive than fear of the injured one's wrath comes to be operative in restraining the immediate impulse of the citizen: he fears the disapprobation of all his fellow-citizens, and covets their approval, and the desire for the latter comes finally to be stronger than the desire for his neighbor's property. But the individual mind always reflects in large measure the aggregate mind, and presently the man who through self-denial has secured the approval of the community comes to take pleasure in his own approval. To do the altruistic thing, even when his neighbors do not know of it, gives him satisfaction, because he feels that he would have the approval of the community if his deed were known. And this egotistic sense of satisfaction becomes in time the full-fledged monitor, conscience. How elaborated and dif-

ferentiated it becomes in an advanced civilization, how far its general basal outlines are obscured, needs no comment; but always in its essence it is in the highest man, as in the lowest, merely an approving consciousness within, representing the sentiment which the individual believes would be voiced by the average mind of his race, could that average intelligence pass judgment on his action. That conscience in the last analysis stands for this and nothing more than this, will not, I apprehend, be disputed. It follows that conscience is purely a matter of education, and that its promptings will represent, at any stage of evolution, merely the average social sentiment of that period. Thus the partially civilized man, whose conscience tells him it would be wrong to surreptitiously take his neighbor's bow, will not hesitate a moment to take the bow of a member of another tribe than his own, and will even, if he can do so, slip into the tent and kill the owner himself, returning with an approving conscience to meet the approbation and glorification of all his fellow-citizens. His conscience tells him of right and wrong, but it is right and wrong only in a very restricted sense; questions of absolute ethics have no place in his mind, nor in the minds of his fellows.

I suppose if one were to affirm that the average society of our best civilizations has not advanced as yet much beyond this plane of relative or utilitarian altruism, he would be cried down as a pessimist. Nevetheless one feels forced to venture such an opinion, protesting meantime, however, that he is unreservedly optimistic. But to avoid a controversial attitude, one may waive this point, and claim merely that this utilitarian altruism is the philosophy of a large minority of the race. Such a contention will answer just as well for the present purpose. All will agree that there is a large class in every community whose standards of right and wrong are strictly utilitarian. Whatever they can secure without being detected is fair booty to these unevolved beings. They regard laws not as representing the average ethical status of their race—such terms having no meaning for them—but as strictly arbitrary human pronunciamentos which are to be evaded if possible, obeyed only if unavoidable. These persons will act always on the nearest desire, unless they fear to do so, or unless a more remote desire gives perfectly tangible promise of greater direct personal benefit. They will steal a hat, for example, unless restrained by the fear of detection, or by the belief that in

waiting they stand a good chance of being able to purloin a coat instead. We say of such persons that they have no moral sense, though the statement is not strictly accurate. They are otherwise known as habitual criminals.

"But," it will perhaps be said, "these are exactly the contentions of the criminologists whom you have all along professed to antagonize." Thus far, precisely; but the difference comes now: for the crimnologist holds that these criminals have failed to evolve because their brains were inherently defective. I contend that in the great majority of cases they have failed to evolve because they were human and could not rise far above their environment. I have contended that there are good tendencies as well as bad in everybody, and that the two extremes of the social scale are not *inherently* so very far apart in a moral way. But it is conceded that the conscience—the moral sense—reflects the individual environment. It will further be conceded without argument that the time of plasticity during which conscience is forming is the childhood and adolescent period of the individual. Now, what is the environment in which these habitual criminals are usually reared? Why, an environment of crime. Jeers and curses are the first sounds to greet the infant's ears. By example, if not by precept, it is taught that the object of living is to secure as much as possible from one's fellows with the least possible return; that sin consists in being found out; that a successful and undetected crime is the most laudable of acts. Wax to receive, marble to retain, that young mind was graven deep with the lines of wrong living. A subtle poison permeated every cell of its body; what wonder if it thenceforth gave out none but poisoned thoughts? It were contrary to all experience to expect it to do otherwise, for the environment which counts in moulding us is that with which we come in immediate contact during the formative period of life. The highest thought, the most elevated morals, of any generation are, in a sense, the hot-house cultures of that generation. Just in proportion as they rise above the average understanding and morality of the time, they tend to become unstable. The lower, the more primitive, instincts lie deeper in the grain of the organism. Left to itself, the organism will revert to them as surely as the hot-house plant run wild reverts to its primitive forms. In the one case just as much as in the other, careful training is necessary if the best result is to be obtained.

The flowers of the human mind do not bloom on human weeds.

All education, physical, mental, or moral, is primarily a cultivation of powers of resistance. Incessant attacks are being made upon the organism by environing forces. Disease germs, inclemencies of weather, noxious gases, wage warfare. If the organism cannot repel these it becomes physically diseased. Cares, anxieties, business and social difficulties, worriments, prey on the mind; if they are not repelled, insanity results. Natural appetites, long inherent propensities whose gratification is no longer consistent with the existing standards of society, offer alluring temptations; if these are not resisted, crime is the result. The resistant physical being maintains physical health; the resistant mental being maintains sanity; the resistant moral being maintains a high ethical status, so long as the strain put upon it is not too severe. But the most resistant organism, physical, mental, or moral, has its yielding point. Some can stand more strain, some less, but none is absolutely unyielding; the strongest bridge can bear only a given weight. But manifestly we may guard against breakdown in two radically different ways; we may strengthen the organism or we may lessen the strain that is put upon it. We guard against physical disease by building up the tissues and selecting a healthful environment. We guard against mental disease by educating the mind and by avoiding pursuits that bring intellectual strain. We may guard against crime by developing the higher ethical sense, and by removing temptations to wrong living. How to do this best is the problem of practical sociology.

If this view is correct, the criminal differs from his fellows not so much in inherent depraved tendencies as in defective powers of resistance. The law-abiding individual has or has had many of the same propensities that are patent in the criminal, but they have been corrected, repressed, or even eradicated by the cultivation of higher instincts; that is, by ethical development. The great practical question is: To what extent is a similar cultivation possible in the ranks from which habitual criminals are recruited? In reply, I assert, despite the dictum of the criminologist, that there is no known fact to disprove the belief that a considerable degree of such development is always possible; while abundant data are at hand to prove that a marvelous—

a revolutionizing—degree of such development is often practicable. If the child of criminal parents is allowed to grow up under the tutorage of those parents and their associates, it will be a criminal almost as a matter of course. There is no need to invoke heredity to explain such a case. But there is every reason to believe that the same child placed amid different surroundings would have grown to a far different maturity. It may be said that since the two experiments can never be tried with the same child, and since no two children are precisely alike, the matter can never be brought to a demonstration; but, fortunately, as the matter stands, it has been brought near enough a demonstration to convince any candid person. I do not here refer to the thousands of children who are rescued each year from the slums of cities, and brought up in institutions from which they finally go out into the world as useful, ethical citizens; for plainly the objection just noted applies to every one of these, though even here the results reach a moral certainty. I refer to cases in which the rescue is made after the individual criminal bent has been established and put in practice. Fortunately there are statistics at hand that prove that even after the plastic period of childhood has been spent in the haunts of vice, after the lower instincts have for a time had full sway, much may still be done in many cases to develop the higher ethical sense upon which depends the resistant power that shall shield from crime. I refer to the records of those institutions of which the Reformatory at Elmira, N. Y., is the forerunner and the type in this country.

There is no more cheering message anywhere for the optimist than the history of this institution as epitomized in its last annual report. It appears, fortunately for the present purpose, that the persons admitted there are tested as to their ethical sense on admission, and the startling result is announced that of "moral sense, even such as shown under examination, either filial affection, sense of shame or personal loss," almost 40 per cent. have "absolutely none," and 31 per cent. more, "possibly some." Inquiry being made as to the heredity of these persons, it is found to average of the very worst, insanity or epilepsy being traced in the ancestry of 12 per cent. of cases, and drunkenness "clearly traced" in 38 per cent., "doubtful" in 13 per cent. more. The ancestors were "without any educa-

tion" or could "simply read and write" in 44 per cent. of admissions.

Here, then, if we went no further, would appear to be most conclusive proof of the overmastering power of heredity, justifying the worst prognostications of the alarmists. But there is another side to the story. These "moral imbeciles" have not only inherited bad tendencies, but they have been reared in such a way as fostered the very worst of them. The character of the homes from which they come is said to be "positively bad" in 54 per cent. of cases, and "fair only" in 38 per cent more. The "character of associations" was thought to be "positively bad" in 55 per cent. of cases, and "not good" in 42 per cent. more. The age on admission of these inmates varies from sixteen to thirty years, 43 per cent. being over twenty. Yet of the entire number 19 per cent. were absolutely illiterate, and 48 per cent. more could "simply read and write with difficulty." That this deficiency is due to lack of opportunity rather than to inherent deficiency is shown by the fact that only 1.4 per cent. are considered as mentally deficient, 71 per cent. being of "good" natural capacity, and nearly 9 per cent. more of "excellent" capacity.

These statistics show the matter in another, and, as the sequel proves, a truer light. For the first time in their lives these moral imbeciles are placed in a healthful environment. The result is startling. Dormant tendencies for good, now for the first time given opportunity, blossom out surprisingly, and in a few months we see many of these moral imbeciles discussing ethical questions involving an acute moral sense. Mental and physical training goes hand in hand with the moral, and in due time about eighty per cent. of the prisoners sent there with indeterminate sentences are returned to the outer world, and observation shows that about four-fifths of these become honest bread-winners permanently. More than 2,500 have thus been rescued at this one institution in the past seventeen years, and among these, beyond question, were hundreds that the criminologist would have pronounced hopeless natural criminals. Doubtless there are many respectable citizens of to-day who might when they went to the Reformatory have sat for the criminologist's picture of a "typical murderer."

There is, I say, no more cheering message for the optimist than

this record of the practical salvation of 2,500 souls. And when we reflect that bad habits spread by contagion, and that each of these reformed individuals would have become, if left to himself, a focus for the diffusion of criminal ideas, the full import of the message is seen to be far greater than the bare figures indicate. When each penal institution in the land has come to be such an ethical factor as this, instead of a nursery of crime, as most of them are to-day, the records of criminology will tell a very different story from the doleful one they now present.

If so much can be accomplished with individuals that have developed far on wrong lines before being taken in hand, what may we not expect from younger subjects? The period of development, and hence of plasticity, in the human species is a long one, but the time of greatest plasticity is the period of infancy and childhood. If the influences that are applied then are bad, the task of supplanting them with good tendencies later on becomes doubly difficult, and there comes a time in the history of every individual when the mind, as it were, crystallizes, and can no longer be moulded. This period comes earlier in some individuals, later in others, but it is almost sure to come to all before maturity. A striking analogy in illustration of this may be drawn from lower forms of life. It is well known that the queen bee (the mature female) is developed by a process of forced feeding from a larva that under ordinary circumstances would have produced only a common "worker." Of the thousands of larvæ in the hive, all have the same parentage, and hence precisely the same hereditary tendencies. Every one has the potentialities of a queen, but only in the single one selected by the feeders will these possibilities be realized. A more striking illustration of the power of environment over heredity could not be desired. But in the present connection it is especially to be noted that the higher development can be accomplished only if begun during the infancy of the individual. After the larva has passed a certain stage, no amount of forced feeding will avail to develop it beyond the station of a worker.

The same lesson is enforced by consideration of higher animals. It is familiar knowledge that most wild beasts can be tamed only if taken while young, but that then many of the wildest and fiercest become perfectly tame and tractable. Birds, because of their very rapid development, furnish most con-

spicuous illustrations of the transition from a plastic to what I have just termed a crystallized condition of mind. It is said that young wild ducks when they first come from the shell have no fear whatever of a human intruder, but will nestle contentedly in his hand. But after a few hours of maternal tutorage they become so timid and shy that it is almost impossible to capture them, and if taken they show extreme terror of the being that a few hours before did not at all alarm them. Birds that pass their earlier childhood in a nest do not develop quite so rapidly, but undergo the same transition. A young crow, if taken from the nest during the first week or ten days of its life, becomes the most confiding and amusing of pets, seeming to regard men as beings of its own kind. If a few days later on another nestling is taken, this one also will become domesticated, but it will never be tame and confiding as the first; it will have something of the suspicious nature of a wild crow. Yet another week or ten days, and the remaining nestlings are able to fly about with their parents and have become altogether irreclaimable. No amount of training will ever suffice to tame them. They are "natural, inherent, hereditary" barbarians, apparently; but the tame brother, which, if taken to the woods and placed with its fellows, will fly back to the city and seek out its master in preference to crow companions, is a living illustration that a factor other than heredity has been overlooked in such a verdict. I once had a tame crow that followed me often into the field when I went hunting, and have had it sit on my shoulder—or perhaps on the gun barrel—and caw a welcome to wild crows that flew by, with apparently no more thought of leaving me than my hunting dog had of turning wolf. One might almost rest the case for environment on the evidence of such a single case.

Nor is there anything far-fetched in drawing illustrations from lower forms of life to apply to man. The day is past when it was supposed that the human mind is intrinsically different in kind from other minds. It is now known that general biological truths apply to each and every member of the organic scale from highest to lowest. The details of application are varied with each species, but the fundamental outlines are the same in all. And in this connection it may not be amiss to note that the human family contains but a single species.

We need not—indeed we cannot—overlook heredity; but in the light of all these facts is it not wiser to regard each individual vicious little John Doe as the victim of undevelopment, and hence to strive to educate him to a better point of view, than to label him "hereditary criminal" and leave him to the hard fate fortune has originally dealt him? Practical humanitarians have long since answered this question in the affirmative. They have rescued thousands on thousands of little Does from the surroundings of vice, and developed them into useful citizens. The task is not always easy. Even at the age of five or six years a child has imbibed a host of the ideas that are current in its environment, and these early ideas tend to cling. It may require long and patient training before they can be supplanted. But the teacher who, given full sway, remembers the biological truth that individual development must be an epitome of racial evolution, will almost surely succeed in time with the subject who has not progressed too far in the wrong direction. As the racial conscience —as evidenced in its systems of ethics—has developed along the lines of fear of punishment and love of approbation to a final altruism; so the individual conscience must be stimulated along these same lines. Gradually, as the mental horizon of the little "moral imbecile" widens, he comes to see the advantages of substituting future welfare for present desire, and when there dawns upon him the consciousness that he is a factor in the body politic, and that his own ultimate good is coincident with the public weal, his future is practically assured. He has passed from the realm of the criminologist, has ceased to be a natural, hereditary criminal, and has entered the ranks of law-abiding citizens. Still being human, he is not invincible. He is not removed from the possibility of crime. But he has acquired an average power of resistance to the temptations of a normal environment whereas untrained he would have been their ready victim.

H. S. Williams.

NATURAL BIMETALLISM.

BY GEORGE H. LEPPER.

It is scarcely possible that the November elections will result in giving to either of the chief parties to the silver issue the control of all branches of the National Legislature. On the contrary, it seems to be a foregone conclusion that the House and the Senate will be more widely apart than at present on the chief question of the day, and that no legislation on the subject can reach the President so long as the lines remain as now drawn. Such a result would be a victory for the "sound-money" party, inasmuch as no legislation would signify a retention of the gold standard. But this victory is greatly qualified by the fact that some sort of a relief measure has become imperative, and no measure of this character, short of a full recognition of free coinage of silver, will be countenanced by the Senate.

Under these circumstances the horizon shows no sign of breaking clouds. Should the conservatives prevail, what ground have we for hoping that they will succeed better than in the past in the safe and statesmanlike conduct of our financial affairs? On the other hand, should free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 win the day, what can we expect from a theory which holds that arithmetic is a proper subject for legislation—that one dollar can be legislated into two others of equal value?

There remains the plan of securing the co-operation of foreign powers for the establishment of a fixed ratio of coinage between the metals. I cannot understand how anyone who has watched the history of the efforts already made toward this object can manage to retain faith in its early realization. We cannot wait much longer. Nor is it any less puzzling how any European power, or union of powers, can see any advantage to itself in such co-operation with us, in view of the possibility of

our resorting to a silver basis and throwing free our store of gold, for which they are secretly longing. By exchanging their present surplus of silver for double its value of our gold, it is easy to see that gold monometallism would shortly become the only practicable basis for all the European nations, and that the death-blow to international bimetallism had fallen.

When matters have arrived at such a crisis in our affairs as this, it is plain that we have missed the true path, and that we must go back to the beginning for a fresh start.

Let us forget all we know, or suppose we know, about money, and fancy ourselves at the foundation of society, and about to take the first step in the creation of metallic currency. We will suppose gold to be chosen for this purpose, that a certain weight of definite fineness of the metal is agreed upon as a standard of value, and that that standard is called a dollar. In the course of time the advantage of paper currency, based upon the gold of the government, is realized and embraced. The nation becomes involved in war, and bonds issue to provide the means necessary for its conduct. Later it develops that gold, being limited in quantity by nature, and insufficient for our needs, some other substance must be employed along with it, and for good reasons silver is chosen. Here we come face to face with the problem of to-day, but let us work it out naturally. If silver is to aid gold as a basis for our monetary system, it must serve the same purposes, and be accorded the same rights. Of these rights, certainly coinage—unlimited coinage—is the chief. How would this naturally be done? The first query to arise would be, what is the market price of silver? or, how much silver can a gold dollar buy? This being satisfactorily answered, the government must be considered as saying to its citizens and, indeed, to all the world, as it has already said in the case of gold, that it will accept at its various mints or other designated places, all the silver that may be offered, and give in exchange therefor its notes to the amount of as many dollars as the silver at the time is worth in gold dollars. This is an equitable transaction. The following day it is found that silver has increased in value. If the government refuses to follow the commercial ratio, no silver will be offered. The third day silver has fallen below the first day's price. Upon what rule of business, equity, or common sense should the government be

obliged to purchase at the higher price, when it can get all it requires at a lower one? The logic of all this is, that silver shall be monetized at the market price or not at all. Such is the case with gold to-day. Such will always be the case with gold, for an abundance of it will be reflected in the lower price of products, and a scarcity in the higher price of the same products. It is so reflected in the price of silver. What is here said of gold can with equal truth be predicted of all other products. The chief reason why gold is chosen as a standard is, that it is limited in quantity by nature, and therefore cannot be produced to the extent of destroying its fitness for that purpose. The same remark applies to silver, but not in equal degree, consequently it is impossible to establish a ratio of fixed weights between them which shall constantly preserve equivalence in values.

Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that this is at present possible, it cannot be denied that the discovery of fabulous mines of one or the other of the metals may occur at any time that would effectually destroy the ratio we may have fixed, and compel the adoption of a new one. Assuredly the only safe and sensible course is to monetize silver at its market rate from day to day, in which case no such contingency as suggested could arise.

The question is, how can this be done? Very easily and simply. It will be admitted at once that the market rate of to-day can be determined. Begin with that rate, and the fact that a great government like our own has, by a close investigation of the matter, found such to be the rate, and that it has adopted it in its own operations, will serve, within a narrow margin, to maintain it for a long period. Should either metal be found to increase in production to an extent to disturb this rate, the government, not being committed to that particular ratio, may follow the market like any other financial concern, and constantly exact *quid pro quo*.

Upon receipt of the silver bullion at the places which may be designated for the purpose, let the silver be duly weighed and assayed in order to determine its value in gold at the current market rate. Let this silver, then, be fashioned into bars of fixed weight (not values or money) and stored in our treasuries or sub-treasuries, and let the customer be given in return notes for as many dollars as the silver has been found to be worth, and

make those notes legal tender. These notes must be redeemable at any future time, not in the exact quantity of silver in exchange for which they were issued, but in a *dollar's worth* of silver, whatever may be the current rate at the time of such redemption. But more than this. We are now creating money, and we have gold and silver both as a joint basis for our monetary system; consequently we must make these notes redeemable as well in standard gold coin, dollar for dollar.

Now I contend that all money issued by the government should be and must be redeemable in one and the same manner, if it is to maintain parity of value. For this reason all the money of the government outstanding—silver, gold, or paper—shall be likewise redeemable in the same manner as the notes I have described, or be convertible into such notes. Gold brought for coinage should be treated in like manner as the silver, and should be redeemable either in gold or in the equivalent of that gold in silver. The principle should be extended also to our bonds, which, being payable in "coin," offer no obstacle to payment in this manner.

The underlying fallacy in all previous efforts to solve this question has been in the assumption that because the gold standard is of fixed weight silver should be treated in like manner. We are now concerned with *values*, and the gold dollar is no more a standard of weight for measuring the value of silver than for measuring that of wheat or any other commodity.

Let me summarize the three principles fundamental to my theory of *true* or *natural* bimetallism, and then leave the reader to apply the theory to the difficulties he has encountered in his own cogitations upon the subject. I am confident he will find that it will answer every requirement of the problem to which it applies. These principles are:

First. That one standard only is conceivable in thought, or possible in practice.

Second. That the market value must control in the coinage of the companion metal.

Third. That all obligations of the government, present and future, reading in dollars, shall be paid or redeemed, at the option of the government, either in standard gold coin, or in so much silver as shall on the day of redemption be equivalent thereto at the general market rate.

GEORGE H. LEPPER.

NOVELS WITHOUT A PURPOSE.

BY GRANT ALLEN.

THE nineteenth century has tolerated to some extent that inartistic and jejune gaud, the novel without a purpose: the twentieth century, holding higher and truer conceptions of art, will soon outgrow it.

I am well aware that to many readers at the present day this forecast will sound like a wild paradox. It is the novel *with* a purpose that they have heard decried as puerile and inartistic. But what *is* a paradox? In nine cases out of ten, is it not the bold statement of an obvious but neglected truth, too long obscured by blatant iteration of a clamorous falsehood? Now, in this matter of the object and function of fiction, a certain dominant.(though retrogressive and obscurantist) school of critics has for some twenty years been dinning into our ears a dogma wholly alien to the real tendencies which this age has displayed for at least a century. It has been preaching and vociferating its poor little formula of "Art for Art's sake," in season and out of season, till most people at last have almost begun to believe it for its much speaking. It has essayed to convince us that the childish desire for a story which is no more than a story ought somehow to rank above the adult preference for a story which points a moral, besides adorning a tale. And it has done this in spite of the patent fact that all the most successful novels of the last half century, from *Uncle Tom's Cabin* to *Jude the Obscure*, have been novels *with* a purpose; that the tendency to write and to read such novels with a purpose has steadily increased throughout the whole of this period; and that the purpose itself has become with each decade more and more important, relatively to the mere infantile pleasure of telling or hearing a story of adventure. In short, our critics have set out with a false theory

of art, and then have attempted to twist plain facts into accordance with their theory.

In opposition to this obsolescent school of criticism I wish to show here two things: first, that as a matter of fact the tendency of the higher fiction, from beginning to end, has been all in the direction of a constantly deeper and more plainly avowed purpose; and second, that as a matter of principle the highest and truest art is and must be the art with a purpose. And I shall further suggest as a corollary the conclusion that the twentieth century—presumably one in which the ethical impulse will have even a stronger hold than it has had in the nineteenth—is likely to demand a still larger amount of purpose in its art, and a deeper conception of what purpose is adequate.

I begin with the matter of fact. I think it undeniable, to anybody who examines as a whole the fiction of the nineteenth century, compared with that of the eighteenth, that the ethical element in the newer work far outweighs that in the older. In England, especially, most of the fiction of the Georgian period precisely mirrors the essentially unprogressive thought of the epoch in which it was produced. It is either decorously dull and conventional, like Richardson; or else boisterously vulgar and human, like Fielding. It lacks inner meaning. True, in certain of its outcomes, such as *Clarissa Harlowe*, an attempt is made at a certain impression of a supposed moral lesson; but this moral lesson is almost always trite and commonplace—a lesson of the most trivial copybook order: "Be virtuous as your grandmother understood virtue!" It marks no advance in the ethical thought of the race; it is statical, like *Adam Bede*, not dynamical, like Rousseau, Shelley, Tolstoi, Ibsen. In this half-and-half category, I would place those eighteenth-century works, such as *The Vicar of Wakefield*, or *Pamela*, or even *Paul et Virginie*, in whose pages the accepted code of morals is enforced and accentuated by means of a story whose main interest depends upon its character and incident, or its descriptive passages, not on its position as marking progress for humanity. The literature of the eighteenth century in England knows nothing of *problems*.

In France, the impulses which went to make up the nineteenth century awoke and realized themselves earlier than elsewhere. Therefore it is in France that we find the novel with a purpose already becoming a weapon of progressive thought in

the powerful hands of Voltaire and Rousseau. This it is, I think, which gives to such sketches as *Candide* and the *Nouvelle Héloïse* their universal and lasting value. Outside England and English-speaking America, how many people know anything of *Tom Jones* or of *Sir Charles Grandison?* But all the world, from St. Petersburg to Lima, knows Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot. And why? Because these French thinkers (oh! yes, I know that Rousseau was Swiss)—these French thinkers represent a moment in the development of human thought; they mark time for the race; what they had to say was new and interesting in all countries equally. The nineteenth century had its precursors in the eighteenth, especially in France, and it is those precursors who speak to us still with most world-wide authority.

In England, the novel with a purpose began its course feebly with *Sandford and Merton* and Miss Edgeworth's stories. I acknowledge that these examples are damaging to my cause; but I have confidence enough in my case to expose them frankly to the barbed shaft of the enemy. During the early half of the present century, the movement towards purposive fiction did not make much headway either in Britain or America. Its place was taken, as we shall see a little later, by the purposive poetry of Shelley, Keats, and Wordsworth. Godwin's *Caleb Williams*, however, is an example to the contrary; and so are a few others like the curious romances of Thomas Love Peacock. Yet on the whole, it must be confessed, the essentially reactionary Romanticist school, represented early by Byron, Scott, and Châteaubriand, later by Bulwer Lytton, Victor Hugo, and Tennyson (I am speaking very broadly) carried the day for awhile both in England and France as against the newer purposive and ethical literature heralded by Shelley. It is noteworthy that the dogma of "Art for Art's sake" derives its origin from this romantic school—from Gautier and Baudelaire: it is, in fact, a legacy of the reaction of Waterloo and the evil days before 1830.

As the nineteenth century progressed, however, it became abundantly clear that the novel without a purpose was ceasing to engage the best intellects of the nations. Gradually fiction began to think and to teach, instead of merely amusing. In England Charlotte Brontë, that double-dyed Celt—half Irish, half Cornish—raised the true Celtic dragon-standard of revolt in *Jane Eyre* and elsewhere. The purpose as yet was not indeed obtru-

sive ; but it was there undeniably, and it had germinal value; it set people thinking. The function of the Celt in literature, indeed, is always the same. "Have ye a government?" he asks. "Thin I'm agin it." He is the preacher of upheaval. The popular novelists of the mid-century, it is true—Thackeray, Dickens, Trollope—did not try to think, or to make others think, either. They were content with mere passive delineation of character. But while they were in the zenith of their fame, a new and revolutionary school, beginning with the Brontës, was slowly working its way upward into favor. George Eliot *did* think, though in a formless way, and often with strangely reactionary results ; her whole literary work seemed to those who knew her like a deliberate contradiction of the aspirations for freedom in her life and conduct ; it is wonderful how a woman, who felt and acted as she did, could have stooped to write novels so unworthy of her place as a pioneer in the movement for the emancipation of women. George Meredith also dates back his beginnings to this formative period ; and anyone who follows him from *The Shaving of Shagpat* and *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel* down to *Diana of the Crossways, One of Our Conquerors,* and *Lord Ormont and his Aminta,* cannot fail to observe the constant growth in importance of the underlying purpose. Nor is it immaterial to observe that the same world which devoured *The Newcomes* and *Nicholas Nickleby* took little note at the time of Meredith's masterpieces.

The last decade or two in particular have given us increasing proof of the growth in popularity of the novel with a purpose, and the consequent relegation of the novel without a purpose to its proper place—the school-room or the nursery. We have been overwhelmed by stories like Mrs. Humphry Ward's—instinct with moral lessons. Now, I do not for a moment mean to imply that Mrs. Humphry Ward's moral lessons commend themselves to my soul. The popularity of *Robert Elsmere* is a marvel to those who had outgrown Robert Elsmerism before they were born ; while the popularity of *David Grieve,* a smug exhibition of the British sense of moral superiority to those vicious Continentals, is an insult to the ethical tone of France and of enlightened England. Still, the fact remains that these essentially purposive books, be they good, bad, or mediocre, have attained an enormous circulation in our own time, and have done so mainly on the strength of their purposes. Another similar instance was

that ponderous *John Inglesant.* Later still, the chief successes of the decade have been made by *The Heavenly Twins, The Yellow Aster, Keynotes, Tess,* and a dozen more equally purposive stories. Miss Marie Corelli and Edna Lyall, each in her own way, illustrate the same tendency. Even *Trilby* owes part at least of its singular popularity to what it may contain of widening and expanding power—it is largely accepted as a covert protest against prevalent English and American Puritanism.

If one sets against these distinctly purposive successes the success of such other writers as Rider Haggard, Anthony Hope, Stanley Weyman, and Conan Doyle, it will be clear, I think, that the former class as a whole mark the taste of adult men and women, of the more thoughtful and progressive, of the makers and moulders of the coming century; while the latter class as a whole mark the taste of boys and girls and casual readers, of the survivors from the past, of the conservative and reactionary as against the progressive and ascending element. I do not mean that Doyle and Weyman have not done admirable work of its kind; I merely mean that their work (as a rule) does not aim at the highest audience. (Even this is not true of Doyle's work in all cases.) Books, on the other hand, like Hardy's *Tess* and *Jude,* like Olive Schreiner's *Story of an African Farm,* strike the keynote of our century. They are instinct with our hopes, our fears, our problems. They could not have been written in any age save this; while *She* and *A Gentleman of France* might almost equally have stepped out of some other century. I do not deny, of course, that the romantic temperament and the love for books of adventure (especially among the young) will always live on; but I believe that side by side with these the taste for books of thought and ethical teaching will always increase, and in an accelerated ratio. I think men and women will less and less be content, like children, with mere hearing of a story; they will demand from their novelists something that at the same time instructs and elevates them.

"But where do you put Stevenson in this gallery of recent writers?" Ah, Stevenson is—Stevenson. A great artist in his way—perhaps even more of an artist in fibre than Meredith and Hardy, though less of a thinker—he was an artist alone, and little beyond it. He had his ideas, it is true, his *aperçus,* his rebellions, his fancies; and those who can look an inch below the surface may

often read them. Yet, on the whole, I am prepared to give Stevenson over as a free gift to the enemy—to treat him rather as a survivor from the early nineteenth than as a precursor and herald of the twentieth century. He was a semi-barbaric Scandinavian-Celt of the Western Islands, at home at Skerryvore, among the foam of the Atlantic. His boyishness, indeed, with its natural concomitant in love of adventure, was one of his most charming and lovable characteristics. Great craftsman of words as he was, he never quite grew up; he loved to sleep out in a sack in the Cevennes, to canoe on French rivers, to fraternize with Samoans on the beach of Falesá; and the childish side in him endeared him to all of us. But I cannot help thinking the adult and virile temperament of Meredith, the adult and civilized temperament of Hardy, is higher and deeper than the untamable boyishness and delicious waywardness of the hermit of Samoa.

Kipling again? Well, Kipling is undoubtedly a real force in our literature, a typical embodiment of the bulldog instincts of the Englishman. But he stands somewhat aside from either of the main currents of the day. Nor do I desire to class all writers as better or worse, simply in so far as they happen to represent or not to represent purpose in fiction. Nevertheless, I would say that, in a wider sense, Kipling too is purposive. His aim is exegetical. He does not merely put before us vivid and graphic pictures of Anglo-Indian society, of the jungle world, of military or seafaring life, of the East End of London. He has a mission of his own, in a globe that is daily becoming more and more complex. It is the mission of interpretation. He set out to a great extent as the literary exponent of the Romance of the Clash of Races. Our planet is daily shrinking—and also expanding. Shrinking as regards distances, and the time taken to traverse them; expanding as regards the number of nations, races, creeds, and moral codes which the average citizen now begins to cognize or to come in contact with. East and West have joined hands; Egypt, Japan, South Africa are part of us. Kipling has made himself, on one side of his work, the laureate of the resulting strife and intermixture. In this direction, many other writers of the day may be fairly classed with him—Stevenson in his Pacific stories; Rider Haggard in his wild South African tales; Hall Caine in his Morocco romance; Gilbert Parker in his admirable Canadian episodes. I am not here class-

ing these writers together, of course, as regards literary merit; their planes are various; I am merely huddling them into the same rough category as exponents, each on his own plane, of the cosmopolitan ideas necessarily engendered by an age of rapid European and American expansion. For to make us grasp in its totality the vast and varied world in which we live and move and have our being is surely in itself an adequate purpose.

Closely allied with this group of quasi-purposive authors, whose vogue shows at least the interest felt by the general reading public in the wider world around them, I would place the other and overlapping or partially coincident group of authors who deal with outlying factors or minor elements in our own more domestic western civilization. Time was when English and American fiction dealt mainly with the ladies and gentlemen of England, the cultured New Englanders, the polite society of New York or Philadelphia; if more than that, then at best it concerned itself with the farmers of the Midland Counties, the rough Yorkshire moorlanders, the miners of the Western States, the grangers of the prairies. But nowadays, that intense desire of half the world to know how the other half lives has produced a new type and crop of fiction. We want to hear of kings and tinkers. Thrums and Donegal have begun to find voice. Tommy Atkins himself is no longer mute. Zangwill tells the West End all about the Jews in the slums of Whitechapel. Miss Murfree tells the North and East all about the ins and outs of life in the Tennessee mountains. We are familiar with Cape Cod and Simla, with "Brer Fox" and "Brer Rabbit," with Cable's Creoles, and Rolf Boldrewood's Australians. Amélie Rives introduces us to West Virginian ginseng diggers. Thomas Hardy transports us to the old-world cabins of Wessex peasants and woodlanders; William Black to the bothies of Highland crofters. "Q," with his Cornishmen, Mrs. Field with her Moonlighters, are other instances. There is no part of Connemara, no district of the Sierras or the Canadian West, which now lacks its *vates sacer*, its inspired illustrator. And I hold that this tendency to minute specialization and localization is closely bound up with the purposive tendency in fiction; both because the same men and women are engaged in either type, and because the delineation of strange undercurrents and phases of human life is in itself educational.

Hardy, for example, who gave us *Under the Greenwood Tree*

and *Far from the Madding Crowd*, is also Hardy who gave us *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*. Hall Caine, who sets before us the Isle of Man and its Deemsters, is Hall Caine who, though from the conservative side (as I take it), approaches those same underlying problems of sex which form the main theme of Hardy and Meredith. Moreover, the passion for the description of local, rural, and distinctively tribal or provincial life is closely bound up with the revolt of race, the seething and pervasive democratic movement which in Europe at least is bringing the Celt, the Slav, the Czech, and the Magyar to the front, as against the old dominant English, German, and Latin elements. The dregs and the scum will have their innings. Hence the modern Celtic revival in Scotland, represented by Fiona Macleod, William Sharp, Patrick Geddes, and their compeers; hence the Celtic revival in Ireland, represented by Yeats, Nora Hopper, and so many other vigorous new writers; hence the Scandinavian outburst, the fresh young Russian literature; hence Jokai and Maeterlinck; hence the flowering of the Breton in Renan, Guy de Maupassant, and seafaring Pierre Loti—the latter of whom represents for France the same roving or specializing tendencies as are represented for England by Stevenson and Kipling, for America by Bret Harte, Miss Murfree, and Cable. (I need hardly say I am speaking again not as to style but as to subject-matter.) Nay, is it not even a significant fact in the same direction that England has read with deep attention Miss Mary Wilkins's New England tales and Mr. Harold Frederic's *Illumination*—in which forcible story we are transported on the enchanted carpet of fiction to a village in Northern New York, where mention of Europe is not, yet where the self-same problems of faith and life meet the local minister which meet every thinker in London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna? It is the purpose that makes such localized work universally interesting.

If we take Europe as a whole, I do not think we can doubt the constant progress of its literature in purposiveness during the past half-century. Even Hugo, prince and false prophet of romanticists—poor fallen god, whom all may now rail at—showed in his own way the prevailing tendency. For what is *Les Misérables* but a sermon on the underlying text of socialism? What are *Le Roi s'amuse*, and *Les Travailleurs de la Mer*, but disguised social and political pamphlets? With the younger gener-

ation, however, the tendency has been still more marked. Even Alexandre Dumas *fils* showed it. In Zola purposiveness reigns supreme—a cold, scientific, plodding purposiveness, as wooden as French scientific work in general; yet full of meaning in every line and touch and incident. A careless reader might deny the same note to Guy de Maupassant and Bourget, who, indeed, fall largely into the same wide category as our own Stevenson. (I hope it will be borne in mind that I am everywhere dealing with all these writers from a single standpoint only—*not* that of technical literary criticism.) But Maupassant and Bourget themselves—especially the latter—have an underlying purposiveness that cannot be masked by their artistic conscience. As for the North, the case is clear. Ibsen more than any other man stands out for us to-day as the accepted pioneer of the twentieth century; and Ibsen never writes except because he has something in his soul to teach us. *The Doll's House, Hedda Gabler, Ghosts, The Master Builder*—what does the outcry against them signify save that Ibsen had an original idea to impose upon the world, and that the world as yet was not ready to accept it? Only new principles can ever rouse such virulent opposition. And similarly with the Russians. Tolstoi's ideas do not seem to me the ideas that are likely to rule the coming world; but at any rate they are ideas; and it is for the sake of the ideas that Tolstoi writes, not merely to give us passing pleasure.

Taking the world round, then, I say (and omitting on purpose America, with which I do not feel myself competent to deal), I see one truth standing out quite clearly. From first to last, the nineteenth century has constantly demanded, and has constantly been supplied with, more and more purposive fiction The demand and the supply still continue to increase. Therefore I infer that the literature of the twentieth century in turn will be increasingly purposive.

And in being so, it will also be *right*. It will follow a law of all literary development from the beginning of all things. A broad survey of the progress of literature from its outset will show us that purpose has ever played a larger and larger part in literary work with each age in each nation.

Every literature begins with naïve and somewhat childish narration—the myth, the epic, the fairy-tale, the saga. As it progresses, it grows deeper, more philosophic, more ethical, more

purposive. The best never comes out of a civilized man, save when he is profoundly stirred by some overpowering social or moral emotion. Our test of the higher as opposed to the lower art is just, othe things equal, the proportion of this philosophic and ethical interest to the mere æsthetic element. I do not mean to say, of course, that the highest literature, *as* literature, is the scientific treatise, the philosophic essay, the ethical pamphlet. To guard against that misconception, I insert above on purpose the saving clause, "other things equal." Literature must needs above all things be literary—it must have grace of style, beauty and aptness and novelty of wording; it must appeal first of all to the æsthetic sense, not to the pure reason or the moral nature. But granting the presence of these purely literary qualities, that literature is highest which most combines with them a deeper philosophic and moral value. Why do we all feel Shelley to be far and away the greatest of English poets? (I exclude Shakespeare, who is the first of English novelists and dramatists, but not quite the first of English poets.) Clearly because we all feel that Shelley touched heights of philosophic thinking and of moral beauty never elsewhere combined with such exquisite imagery, such poetic imagination, such immortal melody. Why do we all feel Keats to stand just one degree beneath Shelley's level? Clearly because Keats, in other respects the most poetical of English poets, the finest example of pure poetic temperament, falls short of philosophic and moral height; he is merely the perfection of the artistic nature. Why do we think *Hamlet*, again, a greater play than *Romeo and Juliet*? Clearly because we feel the deeper and more purposive thought in *Hamlet*. What makes *Faust* the chief crown of glory in German literature? Clearly, the breadth of its philosophic outlook, the vastness of its aim, the profound moral vistas of which it allows us here and there to catch passing glimpses. Height may be measured, other things equal, by the greatness of the philosophic and ethical admixture.

Take in detail a few examples. Hellenic literature begins, like all other literatures, with the mere heroic story. We admire in its first efforts the Homeric ring, the full-mouthed sonorousness; we are captivated by the remoteness from our world and its problems—by the clash of bronze arms, the *naïveté* and simplicity of the domestic relations, the clang of the Iliad, "the

roar and thunder of the Odyssey." We listen open-mouthed to the doughty deeds of Diomede, the song of the Sirens, the tale of Calypso, the ravings of Polyphemus. But we feel to the end that, strange and beautiful and weird as are these old-world imaginings, with their vivid pictures and their rolling music, they are childish at heart with the childishness of the barbarian; they do not in any way satisfy the longings and aspirations of civilized humanity; their interest is largely fictitious and archæological. Indeed, it is as a relief and refuge from our "obstinate questionings of invisible things" that we most enjoy the change from our own literature to the purely objective and barbaric atmosphere of the Homeric poems.

Very different is the tone of the great Athenian tragedians. There we feel at once the conservative grandeur and solemnity of Æschylus; the philosophic doubt and ethical inquiry of Sophocles; the frank scepticism and human reconstruction in many plays of Euripides. What a gulf between the quarrels of the gods in the Iliad and the sublime suffering and patience of the bound Prometheus! What a gulf between the despotic tone of the Homeric Agamemnon or the Homeric Odysseus, say in the incident of Thersites and the pæan of triumphant freedom in the *Persæ*, the outburst of human passion in the *Antigone* or the *Bacchæ!* Greek literature grows steadily from the descriptive and interesting to the profound and purposive; it finds its culminating point at last in the reasoned philosophic and ethical thinking of the Attic tragedians.

Take the three other great epics of the world, again—the *Æneid*, the *Divina Commedia*, and *Paradise Lost;* what comfort can the advocates of the novel or poem without a purpose derive from those great works? They must be clever indeed if they can wriggle round them. Look at the *Æneid* first. What made a brother bard break forth beforehand in that enthusiastic declaration,

> "*Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graii,*
> *Nescio quid majus nascitur Iliade?*"

Was it not his consciousness that the *Æneid* was the worthy and fitting epic of a great unifying and cosmopolitanizing movement—that movement which made Rome not so much the mistress as the embodiment of a pacified and unified world, and which

enabled a later poet to apostrophize her with truth in that eloquent pentameter,

"*Urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat?*"

It is this overpowering sense of the majesty and the moral destiny of Rome—this conception of the organic evolution of a world-city from a small beginning—that inspired Virgil so high above even the level of the Second Georgic. This it is that makes him recur so often to the mighty future of the race of Æneas and to set in the very forefront of his noble exordium the stirring line:

"*Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*"

Or, look at Dante again. Can anybody deny that the main inspiring idea of Dante's colossal work is the true mundane order, the proper relation of Church and State, of Priest and Prince, of Pope and Emperor? There, as on the frescoed wall of Santa Maria Novella, we behold the crystallized concept of the great European party to which the poet belonged—the concept of a well-organized and well-governed Europe, still regulated by the splendid Roman and Virgilian ideal, *plus* the new feature of the Christian religion. Whether we agree with this ideal or not, it was, at least, a large and liberal conception; it was vital in its day, and it dominates every line of the Tuscan poet's thinking.

As for Milton, he pleads guilty to purposiveness from the very beginning—pleads guilty, and glories in it. "To vindicate the ways of God to man" is the expressed purpose of the argument in his epic. And every word the mighty Puritan wrote is intensely purposive. *Paradise Lost* is a theory of theology—and heretical at that. *Samson Agonistes* is a political pamphlet. *Comus* is a singularly unconvincing though beautiful and fanciful tract on the ascetic side of the question of sex—just as the essay on *Freedom of Divorce* is a later expression of mature opinion in favor of a particular form of laxity. From beginning to end, Milton was a glorified and ennobled pamphleteer; he wrote his pamphlets with a purpose first and a divine beauty second, for without the purpose they would never have been written.

Every other literature tells us the same tale. We start in all with sagas, stories, folk-songs, *märchen*. We progress to the drama and novel of character; we end with the Euripideses, the

Ibsens, the Merediths. Chaucer and Boccaccio form the first term in a series which goes steadily on to Shelley and Goethe. And we all instinctively feel that the greatest and truest poets and romancers are those who have taught their age somewhat: Wordsworth, not Scott; Shelley, not Byron. Even outside the more definitely purposive work, we also feel that relative height may best be gauged by intensity of purpose. Keats himself, when judged by this standard, is really purposive; for in a world too dead to the worth of pure beauty, he revived the naked Greek ideal of the simply beautiful. With Tennyson, the highest work is surely that which, like *In Memoriam, Maud,* and such lyrics as *Wages,* or *The Higher Pantheism,* strives to realize some aspect of the philosophic and religious thought of the epoch he mirrored. Anybody who looks for the keynote in Rossetti and Swinburne will similarly find it in the love sonnets and in such poems as *The Blessed Damosel,* the *Ode to Victor Hugo, Hertha,* the *Lines to a Crucifix,* the *Hymn to Proserpine,* and *Dolores*—all of which image forth some thought of the period. I end where I began. The greatest novels and the greatest poems are thus clearly seen to be those which most *mark time* for humanity.

A work of art, I admit, is not a pamphlet or a proposition in Euclid, but it must enclose a truth, and a new truth, at that, if it is to find a place permanently in the front rank of its own order. Even of other arts than literature this is essentially true—as witness Botticelli, Burne Jones, Donatello, Wagner. Painting, sculpture, music, to be truly great, must crest the wave of their own epoch. In literature, however, no work can be considered as really first-rate unless it teaches us somewhat—not merely pleases us. The critic who insists on absence of purpose is shown by the greatest examples of the past, and by the working of the time-spirit, to be merely a belated and antiquated anachronism.

Thus the novel without a purpose stands condemned on its very face as belonging inherently to the second class, and to the infancy of humanity. It will continue to be written, no doubt, for the younger generation, and the inferior minds; but in the twentieth century, I venture to believe, the adult and educated public will more and more demand from its literary caterers adult interests, adult sympathies, a philosophic aim, an ethical purpose.

GRANT ALLEN.

A NEWPORT SYMPOSIUM.

BY MRS. BURTON HARRISON.

On the veranda of the Newport house appertaining to the clever and well-to-do Mrs. Gramercy, *of New York, a party of people are drinking tea while discussing the formation of an ideal society that shall take precedence over the corporate body at present distressing America at large as the "*Four Hundred*" of New York.*

The hostess (*to* Mr. Gryde, M. P., *who having landed the Saturday previous from the "Lucania," and journeyed at once to see Niagara, has arrived in Newport thoroughly equipped as a commentator on American social life*). And pray, what hints have you to contribute to our Utopian project?

Mr. Gryde (*spare and dark, with tonsured head, dressed in a neatly fitting suit of gray cassimere and wearing in his button-hole a large bunch of white carnations*). Oh! my dear lady, you expect too much of a new-comer. But—if you will permit a mere ghost of a suggestion—

Mrs. Gramercy (*with resignation*). I see by your smile that we are going to get it! But, go on.

Mr. Gryde (*dispassionately, but warming to his subject.*) If I had any improvement whatever to suggest in your present amiable and gracious system of social life, it is that you might recall a certain quality of gay and good-humored daring that I seem to remember—that we old-country people have learned to expect from you Americans, and banish a conventionalism that is both material and dull.

Mrs. Gramercy (*to the circle*). Didn't I say so? They always do, when they begin. But go on. Let the British lion growl!

Mr. Gryde (*patiently*). In the ideal society, I should exclude from your drawing-rooms the present abiding evidence of, and the frequent allusion to, money and money's worth.

Mrs. Gramercy. Oh! Oh! As if you English are not the Mammon worshippers of Europe.

Mr. Gryde. Granted. But we do not talk of it at the dinner table. In the ideal society, the host will not entertain the stranger guest with astonishing statements of the money-getting achievement of his neighbors and fellow-revellers. When a noble portrait, painted by some great foreign artist, of the host's wife or daughter, is exhibited, the guest will not be allowed to know the amount of the check rendered in lieu of it. If the host has written a rather successful book upon political economy or finance, he will not confide the retail price of the volume in question when about to offer to present a copy to his friend. If a man takes a stranger for a drive behind a beautiful and coveta-ble pair of well-bred horses, the stranger will not need to know the price paid for them, in order to appreciate their merits. If a new room—some grand *salon* fitted with tapestries from a decayed palace of the Old World—is thrown open, the astonishing cost of these sumptuous draperies will not be whispered about among the guests. When a lovely woman is pointed out at a ball, the chain of jewels around her swan-like neck will not be appraised by her exhibitor. I almost think that, in your ideal society, there should be no such word as dollar.

Pretty little Mrs. Pert (*who, to the air of a fashion plate, adds a young child's readiness for fearless attack*). Or we might impose a fine of one dollar for charity, every time the word dollar is pronounced. But, dear me, Mr. Gryde, how much you have found out in three days at Newport! Let me tell you that, if you only give us time, we will get over being impressed by our recent acquisitions. Over here, we are still, as you would say, "by way" of thinking it an important thing to dine at eight o'clock, and be served by liveried lackeys. In England, you've had ages in which to exhaust all such minor sensations.

Mr. Gryde (*benignantly*). We have exhausted most sensations—*except* that to be had in bowing down before the shrine of Beauty.

Little Mrs. Pert. Well, at home, you don't do much bowing down that I ever saw—unless, indeed, the Beauty belongs to some

one else. In that respect, I own, we are behind you. But we are trying hard to catch up.

Mrs. Gramercy. For shame, Edith. It is no such thing, Mr. Gryde. As a class, we are still Puritans.

The Count de Rivoli (*a blonde young Frenchman, of charming exterior and polished manner*). Madame, I agree with you. So much so, that I ask myself if my penetration be not at fault—if beneath the frozen surfaces so many of your beautiful women present there is not a warm current flowing that needs only the freedom of older societies to break the ice and make it leap into joyous evidence.

Little Mrs. Pert. Unless you are a very good skater, Count, I'd advise you not to venture on that ice.

Mrs. Gramercy. Perhaps the Count will give us a point or two upon what we are to omit from our ideal society.

The Count de Rivoli. Madame! You ask me, who am daily enchanted with the exquisite graciousness of your American hospitalities. But if you insist—if I may presume to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Gryde, to find a fault in the present structure—I should suggest—with a thousand apologies—a slight infusion of gayety into your too formal entertainments. Your houses, your women, your wines, your *chefs*—deserve all admiration; but I would ask to hear talk across the table, instead of little eternal duets around the table—that talk of the wits and of the lips that makes a good dinner a refinement of delight. In the future day you picture, perhaps people will not be chained to each other, two and two, like galley slaves, during the courses of an interminable banquet. The hostess will assume to take the lead of conversation; to let fly a shuttlecock of thought or fancy at which her guests will strike in turn. She will not be content to sit on demurely or wearily while the dining lasts, and look relieved when the affair is over. And ah! Madame, picture to yourself how easy this thing will be for the average American woman—to put life into her reunions! She, who is so gifted by nature with facility of speech and animation of spirit! I cannot for the life of me understand the indifference of some of your reigning hostesses to everything except their decorations, their gowns and their *menus*.

Little Mrs. Pert. You would, if you'd seen them, not so very long ago, living in little hum-drum city houses, with an Irish

girl to wait upon the table, and everything on a scale to correspond. Isn't it like a fairy tale to wake up from that sort of thing and find oneself mistress of a palace in town, a yacht, another palace in the country, and with ability to roam the round world over, and spend money like pouring out water? If that happened to me, I know I'd be dazzled too, and not quite certain what to do with my grandeur.

Mrs. Kindly (*bright-eyed and middle-aged and soft of voice*). Yes, I think it's wonderful that so many of them carry it off as we see them doing. And, with it all, some of them accomplish an immense amount of charitable work, and educate their children beautifully. I, for one, when they ask me, always love to go into one of their fairy palaces, to be part, as Edith says, of a fairy tale. But I should be sorry to be limited to that class of society. Some of them are so taken up with spending money lavishly, they have hardly time to look around them at the outside world; and, consequently, their atmosphere seems stagnant. Whenever I have been to one of the plutocratic luncheon parties, for example, I like to stop in on the way home to sit awhile with an invalid friend of mine, a woman who has never crossed the threshold of one of the "smart set." How her wit plays around everything I give her of what I have seen and heard to comment upon! How supremely she rises above the narrow limits of the talk I have been listening to about petty ailments, and domestic plans, and the matrimonial difficulties of some conspicuous person of the "set." When the ideal society opens its doors, this friend of mine shall have a corner in it, and you will see how animated her surroundings will become. But I would not exclude the present rulers. We are too much in their debt.

Mrs. Gramercy. While we are excluding, I should like to shut out a fashion of woman who has cropped up latterly; not only mannish and brusque, and given to horse-play and lounging and smoking with men in preference to congregating with her own sex—but persistently inclined to talk down the domestic and sentimental side of a woman's life. (Bless me! When one fancies a woman's lot *without* the domestic and sentimental side!) I have often heard such an one scoff at the natural instinct of affection displayed by a young wife and mother for her husband and child—a "kid," is, I believe, what that type calls her own or

her friend's offspring. What she is good for I can't imagine. She doesn't really entertain men, and she intimidates average women.

Miss Ruth Marchmont (*a girl past her first youth, with a keen intellectual face and a fearless bearing*). Pshaw ! That sort has no real weight. A woman of any strength of character will live her own life, and find her own happiness, in spite of their sneers at femininity. They are only temporary blots on the surface of our society. I think I object more to the ones who are satisfied with infinite nothings, who fritter conversation, and stare superciliously at all expressions of original thought, then resume their own chatter without an attempt to take in what has been said. When we open the door into the ideal *salon*, pray Heaven they may be left in the corridor.

Mr. Gryde (*to* Mrs. Gramercy). Triviality of thought and expression, and bluntness of speech, seem to be the "hall mark" upon the fashionable classes everywhere to-day. But I must own I had not yet reached the point of criticising your types, especially of womankind. I look to this conversation for a great deal of enlightenment. Pray, my dear madam, further incite your guests to give me more of these lights upon American society as it is, and as it ought to be.

Mrs. Gramercy (*smiling*). I am afraid we are always ready to discuss. Nobody is certain what our standard is ; and everybody is curious to know what other people think it is. Unfortunately, we are actually without social leaders. With you, in England, it is so easy to look at a Duchess, and do likewise. When we get back to town every year to open our houses for the season we have no idea who, among our acquaintances, is going to be living in her own house, or to be entertaining, much less setting us examples. The newspaper correspondents make the most heroic effort to create for us heads, who, often as not, are at the time living in London or Paris or at Nice, or travelling in Egypt to get rid of disagreeables at home. I myself think it is the fierce light that beats upon the throne of the New York social celebrity that makes our leaders so few and far between. As soon as a newspaper article appears that is more than any feminine flesh and blood can stand, they remember they have the resource of packing up and sailing for the other side, there to remain until the trouble has been forgotten. Then, too, we have no old women.

Look around you, Mr. Gryde, during the next few days, and you will never see a woman's head with a cap upon it, like those dear old stately dowagers one sees in England. To the bitter end of comeliness, we coif ourselves with false hair, and dress youthfully. Oh! (*Here the mistress of the veranda claps her white hands begemmed with diamonds and turquoises.*) In the ideal society, let us have some gray hair and some caps!

Mrs. Kindly. I am sure, Agatha, you and I know several older women, of the best blood in the land too, women whose families have always been accustomed to lead in New York, who could still lead if they exerted themselves to do so—and who dress and bear themselves most becomingly. I am afraid Mr. Gryde will think you are trifling, dear.

Little Mrs. Pert. Mr. Gryde must be quite accustomed to sitting still and having all kinds of rash remarks flying about his head. Don't trouble yourself about him, Mrs. Kindly. I have a conviction that, when he has done listening to our talk, he will have got some points of view that neither Mr. Bryce, nor Mr. Burns, nor M. Bourget seem to have discovered.

Mrs. Gramercy (*pleasantly*). You flatter yourself, Edith.

Little Mrs. Pert. Of course I do. I shouldn't be an American woman, else.

Mr. Easy (*a bachelor of wealth and good temper, who has been on the outskirts of the group devoting himself to a débutante*). When is our turn to come, Mrs. Gramercy?

Mrs. Gramercy. Do you mean what place shall we assign to the men of the day in our new Wonderland? Don't fear; we shall not neglect you. I have a word to say about the eccentrics of society who are made to do duty before the world as figure-heads of our New York morals and manners. I suppose no society could be brought together without having people like these for the others to talk about. London has its full share, Paris as many. If they get in, we must take care to let others see them as we really do, and not exalt these people we are laughing at among ourselves as arbiters and models. Then, there is a character in modern life who always reminds me of the tug that conveys a big steamship out of places where there is any difficulty for it to move alone—the toady, generally well-placed in the world, and often limited in purse, who accompanies the new-rich person in public, and shares her luxuries. In an ideal group

people will be sure of themselves, and the parasite will find her occupation gone.

Mr. Gryde (*quoting "King Canute."*) "Parasites exist always." On my word, I do not see the great difference between your types in New York and ours in London.

Mrs. Gramercy. Except that London is so much bigger, more animated, your average society is not judged by them. We, who are talking of these things, are in revolt, you see, against being classed, without an opportunity for protest, with a small and extremely narrow set of money-spenders whose fortunes dwarf ours, and whose customs extinguish more moderate endeavor among us. We should like the rest of the world to know we have some individuality apart from them. Even the keen sighted and friendly M. Bourget judged the whole of us by the few he met.

The Count de Rivoli. M. Bourget, Madame, meant to be all that is kind. It was such doughty champions as your M. Mark Twain who, entering the lists against him in serious earnest, made his utterances seem a more grave offence than they were.

Miss Marchmont. No doubt. No doubt. But you will not ask us to admit many of M. Bourget's American women into our ideal society.

Mr. Gryde (*to* Mr. Easy, *who has come around to his side, and dropped into a wicker chair by the tea-table*). Tell me. Am I to gather from what these ladies have been saying that your framers of the Constitution, when they shut out hereditary aristocracy from America, did not prevent the subsequent risk of a plutocratic aristocracy that is quite generally recognized throughout the country, and must, of necessity, be more harmful to your national character than our own abused respect for hereditary titles ?

Mr. Easy (*comfortably*). Hum ! They say so ; but I believe most of it is newspaper talk, you know. Capital good fellows among that set, and no idea in the world of putting themselves on a pinnacle. No show about them, either, though they rather like to see their wives and daughters cut a dash.

Mr. Gryde (*stroking his chin*). This change in the conditions of the national mind of America seems to me immensely curious, and full of portent for the future.

Little Mrs. Pert (*catching his last words*). Don't make your-

self unhappy about our future, Mr. Gryde, now that we women have got it in hand It's sure to be run well, if Mrs. Gramercy and Miss Marchmont and I take hold.

Mrs. Gramercy. I think we shall put a lock on your saucy tongue, Edith, if we let you in at all Mr. Gryde, promise me to come to luncheon next Sunday when my husband will be here, and to let him talk over these matters with you from a man's point of view. I just wish you not to think that women dispose of every question in the States. Now, Ruth, dear, have we summed up all the things to be left out ?

Miss Marchmont (*sighing*). I'm afraid not. The list is so long. You know we have always agreed that the people who do not value social triumph unless the newspapers display it to the world, are not to be let in. And those who do everything in such a hurry that they make one feel as if one's breath had given out. The fussy women, overcrowded with affairs ; the women who wear jewels in day time ; those who in company talk all together in a high and shrill key—

Little Mrs. Pert (*interrupting*). I vote that we have done with the women, and go for the men.

Mrs. Gramercy, Miss Marchmont and Mrs. Kindly (*together*). Agreed !

A silence, which is broken by Mrs. Gramercy. I'll declare, it is not so easy as I thought. It really seems as if we could not carry on the functions of social life without the "ornamental" men ; there must be some on hand for dinners and opera boxes, and as ushers at weddings, and to lead cotillions, and drive four-in-hands, and sit behind club-windows. One reason New York is less attractive to look at than London is the rarity of this class in her uptown haunts. Some of them may not be very brilliant in conversation, but others are very lively, agreeable fellows, with plenty of native good sense and rather inclined to condole with themselves upon the leisure of their existence. Besides, they are generally cultivated in minor points, given to manly exercise, and—

Little Mrs. Pert (*interrupting*). In short, they meet a "felt want."

Miss Marchmont. I have no patience with you two.

Mrs. Gramercy. Until we shall have trained up a race of men who will not regard meetings for the interchange of ideas

with women as a bore, who is to take the place of those we now have? If the clever strong-brained men who, it must be, inhabit all those thousands of "offices" down-town, will not consent to emerge from them, what can we poor women do but make the best of the substitutes we have? I believe there are some American men who would regard an afternoon call upon a woman of society, who might offer him a cup of tea at five o'clock, as a distinct admission that he is a weakling and a fribble. This sort of resentment of conventionality is what often makes our men of parts seem crude in the eyes of trained foreigners. It appears to me about on a par with the refusal of the schoolboy to learn how to dance, because it makes him "girly"!

Mrs. Kindly. My dear, you are quite right. There are some of my young nephews and cousins to whom I am always preaching the doctrine of cultivating the exterior graces until they are acquired, and then forgetting all about them. It is so hard to persuade these lads that they will be none the less stalwart, none the less successful in business or in professions, for having a certain grace of manner and tact of speech.

Little Mrs. Pert. But what are you to do when such young men see their fathers refusing to mix with society on the ground that it is all very well for the women, but they have no time to spend on it, or are too tired when evening comes to do more than read a newspaper?

Mrs. Gramercy. The fact is, our husbands and fathers strain too much after success in affairs, and subordinate every other concern to that of making money. Some are in the toils of absorbing and exacting professions, and all of them chase from morning till night "to accomplish in their own lifetimes what in the past it took centuries to effect." We American women, who have the name of being the most indulged class upon earth, are often denied the one luxury we should prefer to all others—leisure time in the society of our husbands.

Mr. Gryde. That is very pathetic. I wish some of these gallant countrymen of yours could hear it.

Miss Marchmont (*shrugs*). They might say it was just another one of our eternal fads. You see, Mr. Gryde, we have come around the circle to where we began; it is the worship of the golden calf that possesses us, and is our bane.

Mr. Gryde (*with a satisfied smile playing around the corners*

of his mouth). Material well-being! High intelligence! Haven't you reached the high-water mark of all society? Why strive for ideals beyond this?

Mrs. Gramercy. That was spoken with indulgence as to a spoiled child. No, we shall not relinquish our bright dream. The more one thinks of it, the wider grows the prospect. There is no capital, no great city, where it could be realized so well as in New York.

The Count de Rivoli. May I enquire your plan?

Mr. Easy. Don't ask. Just wait and see results. It will be sure to be all right, if these ladies are to the fore.

Mr. Gryde. I may be kept busy in my own country and have no chance to see. At least you will give me a general outline of the scheme.

Miss Marchmont. The truth is, so far we have chiefly concerned ourselves with the elements to be left out. For the rest, I have a dim idea of a broad luminous circle of intelligent people of many nations and creeds and pursuits; they will all have moderate or at least not immoderate fortunes, a common recreation ground, and frequent meetings.

Little Mrs. Pert. There you are, off on your hobby, Ruth. Now, *I* am nothing if not practical; and I can see that these divers elements would be very hard to bring together and harder still to keep together.

Mrs. Gramercy. I am convinced that it can be done. Every year adds to the numbers of the class we would draw upon. The walls, if you like, might be supported by the fine ladies with their Worth gowns and jewelled tiaras, though, I think, by that time, the big fortunes will have been graded down; but the central spaces would be thronged with men and women who read, and think, and travel, and discuss, and keep abreast of the movement of the times. Among them would be some of the present class of dwellers in hall bed-rooms in boarding-houses, who would thus find a place for the indulgence of the social instinct. There would be men who can't afford clubs and are bored by theatres; men hard worked all day, who would otherwise be dozing over a newspaper in dull rooms at home until it should be time to go to bed. Busy lawyers and doctors, newspaper men and magazine editors, authors, artists and actors, students of foreign languages, accomplished musicians, experts in science, re-

turned travellers, teachers in schools, and professors in colleges—and, with them all, agreeable foreign visitors! What a host of these might not some Pied Piper of Hamelin witch out of their haunts even to-day in New York to enrich and enliven society? As it is, where does one ever see them congregate?

Little Mrs. Pert. Dear! You quite take my breath away. I hope there will be something for them to eat and drink beside little cakes and weak punch, the way they had it in the French *salons*. My experience is, to keep a genius up to the mark you have to feed him well.

Miss Marchmont (*sharply*). Nonsense! When it comes to this, I think we have talked long enough.

Mrs. Gramercy (*suavely*). Nobody minds Edith. But we shall not adjourn this assemblage until Mr. Easy gives us a glimpse into his opinion on this important theme. In the ideal society we will allow man to speak his mind, you know—after the ladies shall have uttered themselves, of course, and with reservation of our right to the last word if he chances to say anything deserving a reply.

Mr. Easy. In the first place, I think the ideal society will have done much to justify itself, if it abolishes the pernicious practice of promiscuous hand-shaking. Mr. Gryde will perhaps pardon me if I suggest that his countrymen of to-day are, in that matter, even more trying than we are. It is not everybody's hand that even a friend desires to take into his own, under all circumstances. And the only really agreeable method for an ordinary function of that sort is the Chinaman's. Among them, when a newcomer joins a group like this, for instance, there may be a good deal of hand-shaking, to be sure; but nobody shakes the other fellow's. Each clutches his own two hands very cordially, and shakes them with smiling salutation to everybody else.

Mr. Gryde. Yes; I think *that* a very good suggestion.

Mr. Easy. And, while I am making an example of the Orientals, I would borrow another idea from them for our new society. Much of the discomfort we get from envy of our neighbors, and many of the distressing disturbances of the serenity of our present social relations arise from the fact that our neighbor had a grandfather, and we had not. In China, the arrangement is much better; their polity is founded upon respect and vener-

ation for parents; among them, no man can be greater than his own father; and so, if he himself rises to be a prince, it is immediately discovered that his father was really a prince before him—and *his* father before *him*—"and so go on *ad infinitum*" into the remotest antiquity. Though the world may have seen those ancestors in the garb and avocation of rat-catchers, their self-imposed disguise is immediately penetrated in the light of the merit of their descendant; their modesty is no longer suffered to obscure their greatness. And when the elevation of an individual here shall ennoble, not his offspring, but all of his ancestors, every one in our ideal society, where every one is to be distinguished by merit of some kind, may be happy in the ease of manner and repose of mind which now belong only to one who has inherited such traits from at least three generations of training in everything of gentility demanded by the social code.

Mr. Gryde. What prompt relief you would thus afford to those of us in England who yearn to abolish the House of Lords!

Mr. Easy. And, if the ladies will indulge me a moment longer, I venture to suggest to them a final detail of infinite consequence to real happiness in any re-arrangement of society in America. Every school, everywhere, should have competent instructors in the use of the voice; every physician should carry in his pocket a prompt and effectual remedy for our national catarrh. There was a time the rustic Yankee dialect afforded the type for ridicule of our new-world snarl in utterance. But, whether New England has in this respect improved (and I think it has), or some of our more recent regions have developed peculiarities of voice so much more vexatious as to make the Yankee only seem better by comparison with others, the fact is that our most distressing twang in speech to-day is found west of the Hudson River. There is a metallic, unmusical and harsh buzz in the letter R, especially, that bewrayeth us to the least discerning of the rest of mankind; it ought to be abolished by you reformers, even if you must make a new alphabet that has no letter R in it. And, not only that, but, as we have ceased to be of a sparse population, our voices have become too loud. Our immigrants of nearly three hundred years ago brought with them the low and soft voices of their English progenitors; in the wilderness that received them they felt the awe of great solitudes, and must for a time have spoken in subdued tones—as do the wan-

derers to-day in the remote valleys of the great mountain ranges, or over the vast plains of our western wilds. But, as the woods have been cleared away and the prairies have come under cultivation and cities have multiplied, we have learned to address each other in voices like so many peacocks on house-tops exchanging views of the disturbers of the night. The distracting duets the Count has just mentioned as incidents of our dinner parties, are as nothing to the din, clangor, and uproar of a crowded afternoon tea in town. Yes, really you ladies must see to it that no one be admitted into our ideal society whose voice has not been properly assuaged.

Mrs. Gramercy. Come, come, Mr. Easy, what you say is all very true, and we shall make a note of it; but when we asked you for an opinion we hardly expected you to go on at such length. Mr. Gryde, we have treated you unmercifully. But you shouldn't have encouraged us by that twinkle of the eye. And all the rest of you good people have submitted, like angels, to being talked at. Now come into the drawing-room, and let us have some music.

Mr. Gryde. Not till I thank you for having given me a glimpse at a new—a truly national, and I think a possible—structure of republican society.

Mrs. Gramercy (*quietly*). It will come—though I may not be here to see it.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

HOW TO PROLONG LIFE.

DR. HARLEY, in the London *Lancet* of June 18, 1889, calls attention to certain facts often observed by breeders of horses. It is that the recuperative capacity of high-bred horses is less than that of the common quality. He holds that men living in a rude state, such as savages and gypsies, tramps, and the like, and deficient in the refining influences of high civilization, have higher bodily recuperative powers than the intellectual classes. In other words, the more refined our civilization makes us the less able we are to resist disease and recover from its attacks. By the year 1900 probably some other M. D. will take just the opposite view and rout and flout Dr. Harley from all his strong positions. When wise and learned physicians disagree the lawyers and clergy report that the undertaker is usually the referee. (I cannot believe this.) Perhaps the attorney or parson who started this story was some brother in black who had been charged too much for his visits after he was well enough to get along without his M. D. In cases of doubt it is always best to hear both sides. It is said to be a scientific fact that in racing stables firstlings are not preferred. Some writers on longevity in the human being argue from this that first-born children are not so likely to reach extreme age as others of the same family. But we must remember that in the horse it is speed that is required and not longevity. Horses are bred for trotting and racing qualities, not for long life.

Firstlings that are scorned by the fast men and fast horses of the race track may long survive their more lucky brethren who have had the triumphs of a fast life and a merry one. It is to our own indiscretions that imperfections in the digestive and blood-making process are to be charged. The practical point is that we impose upon our organs too much work not only by the undue quantity we eat, but also by the injurious quality of the food and drink we furnish them. People of good common sense, without any scientific knowledge even, soon learn this and avoid such things as they know from experience they are better without. Statements of those who have reached great age nearly always show that they were moderate eaters. Moderation in eating and drinking means moderation in work for the digestive machinery, saving of physical worry to the arteries by keeping the blood which courses through them free from the impurities that may impair the arterial coats. The intestinal canal, the lymphatic system, the salivary glands, pancreas, liver, kidneys, and skin, are all relieved in their functions when too much unnecessary work is not put upon them by a desire to eat improper food and too much of it.

As the question of food enters so largely into the subject of long and

healthy life, some suggestions seem called for in regard to what may be considered most suitable for persons of sixty and upward. It has been urged that a return to nature, or to the food which primitive man nourished his body upon would be the right thing to do. Fruits and nuts appear to have been his dietary, and not flesh and vegetables. Oranges, apples, grapes, figs, bananas, dates, prunes, peaches, and in fact all kinds of sweet fruits and tomatoes are good, because they are deficient in nitrogen and free from the earth salts of other kinds of food. Starchy foods are more difficult to digest than fruits and meats. Nuts, such as almonds, Brazil nuts, filberts, walnuts, hickory nuts, and similar products abound in nourishment and furnish the necessary heat for the body.

Eggs, fish, cheese, milk, especially buttermilk, and poultry of all kinds supply variety. Starch foods are clogging to the system, producing constipation. Invalids are always put upon toasted bread, because the heat acting upon the starchy portions turns it into dextrine; this, being changed to glucose by the action of the stomach, is easily disposed of. Glucose is the sugar of nature as found in ripe sweet apples and in honey. Dried figs, which can be made almost as good as fresh ones, by steeping them in hot water, are extremely nutritious, containing about 68 per cent. of glucose. This when eaten is in just the same condition that the starch of cereal food is after it has undergone a protracted digestion.

Tea, coffee, wine and beer, as well as all alcoholic drinks, are to be taken in extreme moderation, as they are mere stimulants and have no nutriment, or at least very little. Milk is a better drink. As every one knows, if you eat slowly you do not need to drink at all. And that is one of the great advantages of a fruit diet, you get enough of the best quality of water distilled by nature in the fruit, which is also aperient and cooling to the blood, already too much heated by starch foods. Exclusive vegetarianism seems to be injurious to the human system. But people who advocate a diet of fruits and nuts, omitting starch foods and too much bread, are not vegetarians; for they get the heat and strength necessary for health from nuts, lean meats, lamb, veal, and young animals whose systems have not had time to get clogged with the objectionable earth salts. If fresh fruit cannot be obtained at all times, dried figs, raisins, and dates can be steeped in hot water and thus brought to an almost fresh condition. As for whole meal, or Graham bread, the merit that it may have is offset by its irritating effects upon the stomach and intestines, produced by the indigestible bran particles. Sugar furnished by nature in the form of glucose is ready for assimilation, as all physiologists and chemists know.

On the contrary, sugar from cane, beets, maple, and sorghum is insoluble by the system until it has undergone the process of digestion, both in the stomach and the intestines. Now, as salt, pepper, and all irritants, as well as stimulants, like tea, coffee, tobacco, and alcoholic beverages, are goads to the nervous system, the human body, if treated naturally, does not require them. To many they are really poisons. If we were intended for the use of tobacco, it would not make us so dreadfully sick the first time we used it. Man in a normal state does not have to learn to eat nuts and fruits. He craves them as the child does its mother's milk. Animal instinct indicates the law of nature. Since Cuvier's time zoologists have been telling us that man belongs to the frugivorous animals. He is allied to the manlike apes, which live entirely on nuts and fruits, never eating other animals nor cereals.

A Brooklyn physician, translating from a German writer, thus discourses on apples as food and medicine: "The apple is such a common fruit that few persons are familiar with its remarkably efficacious medicinal properties. Everybody ought to know that the very best thing they can do is to eat apples just before going to bed. The apple is excellent brain food because it has more phosphoric acid, in an easily digestible shape than any other fruit known. It excites the action of the liver, promotes sound and healthy sleep, and thoroughly disinfects the mouth. It also agglutinates the surplus acids of the stomach, helps the kidney secretions and prevents calculus growth, while it obviates indigestion and is one of the best preventives of diseases of the throat. Next to lemon and orange it is also the best antidote for the thirst and craving of persons addicted to the alcohol and opium habit."

Dr. De Lacy Evans, in his book *How to Prolong Life*, gives over twenty pages to tables of analysis of foods. As compared with the nourishment they give, fruits and nuts have the least proportion of earthy salts. Animal flesh comes next, then vegetables, and fourth in rank we have cereals and pulses, which are shown to have the largest amount of the earthy matters. From the analysis we see that fruits as distinct from vegetables have the least amount of earth salts. Most of them contain a large quantity of water, but that water is of the purest kind—a distilled water of nature—and has in solution vegetable albumen. We also notice that they are to a great extent free from the oxidized albumens—glutinous and fibrinous substances; and many of them contain acids—citric, tartaric, malic, etc.—which when taken into the system act directly upon the blood by increasing its solubility, by thinning it; the process of circulation is more easily carried on and the blood flows more easily in the capillaries—which become lessened in calibre as age advances—than it would if of a thicker nature. These acids lower the temperature of the body and thus prevent the wasting process of oxidation, or combustion in the system. Exhilarating and stimulating effects produced by tea, coffee, and chocolate, are caused by theine in tea, caffeine in coffee, and bromine in cocoa or chocolate—the latter containing a smaller percentage of the stimulant than the others. All have a similar alkaloid base. Milk has become extremely popular with all classes of physicians of late years. Formerly a fever patient was forbidden to take milk. In modern practice milk is about the only food allowed. An exclusive diet of milk is found very efficacious in diabetes. At the German spas, Carlsbad, Wiesbaden, etc., a very little bread is allowed and the diet mostly made up of milk, eggs, grapes and lean beef. A non-starch diet is the rule, bread, starchy vegetables and cereals being almost excluded. Rice is easily digested and an excellent food, except that it abounds in earth salts. Fruits are not only digested in the first stomach, but they have a large part of their nourishment already in a condition to be absorbed and assimilated as soon as eaten. The food elements in bread and cereals have to undergo a process of digestion in the stomach, and then be passed on to the intestines for a still farther chemical change before they are of use to the human system. This is the great advantage of a diet of lean meats and fruits.

Overwork is not expected from a stomach already jaded, and the nervous wear and tear of the organs of life are avoided. Distilled water should always be used both for drinking and cooking if it can be obtained. Rainwater, if filtered, is perhaps the next best, though not free from objections.

Grapes, say numerous authorities, act very much like mineral waters on the human system. But they are better, because at the same time they nourish the body. Nutrition is increased, secretion promoted, action of the liver, kidneys, and other excretory organs improved, and the phosphoric acid, of which they contain a considerable amount, acts favorably on all the bodily functions, especially on the brain. As is well known, the sugar of the grape requires no digestion, but is taken almost at once into the blood. Dextrine from the grape promotes the secretion of pepsin and thus favors digestion. Most of the vegetarians eat grapes, though they may prefer peas.

Stimulants often assist digestion, but that digestion is best which does not need them.

WILLIAM KINNEAR.

ITALIAN IMMIGRATION.

DR. SENNER'S article in the June number of the REVIEW contains much that is interesting, but exception must be taken to the way in which he handles some of his statistics, and the conclusions which he deduces from them.

(1.) It is to be observed that even during the fiscal years 1894 and 1895, when immigration fell off very much owing to the commercial depression, Italian immigration held its own proportion of the total. The figures are 1890, 11.4 per cent.; 1891, 13.5 per cent.; 1892, 10.6 per cent.; 1893, 16.4 per cent.; 1894, 14.9 per cent.: 1895, 13.7 per cent. In the first four months of the calendar year 1895, the percentage of Italian immigration of the total immigration at New York was 22.6 per cent. This year during the same period it was 30 per cent. During times of commercial depression the least skilled immigration is that which should diminish most; but, in spite of the number of persons recently unemployed in the United States, we find an increase this year over last in the Italian immigration of one-third, nine-tenths of which has no occupation.

(2.) During the spring of this year, it is true that a large number of Italian immigrants were detained for special examination, *i. e.*, there seemed to the inspectors something suspicious about their right to land. In spite of the great parade of the number detained, made from time to time in the newspapers, the number actually excluded has been the trifling fraction of 6.2 per cent., or thereabouts. One may well retort in Dr. Senner's own words, "*Tant de bruit pour une omelette!*" The law of March 3, 1893, was merely an administrative measure, and while it has to some extent improved the immigration service it has not added at all to the classes of persons who may be excluded by the inspectors. Even under this law the proportion debarred in 1894 was only 0.8 per cent. and in 1895 about 1 per cent.

(3.) But the most remarkable use of figures is that which Dr. Senner makes in connection with the settlement of Italian immigrants in the country. Out of those entering the United States during the first four months of 1896 he deducts one-half on the grounds that they have either been in the United States before or are going to join their immediate families, and claims that only the balance can properly be regarded as immigrants! And he says: "Congress cannot justly undertake to force out of this country aliens who have legitimately settled in it, or to prevent their immediate families, unless objectionable *per se*, from joining

them in this country." Very true. But the half which Dr. Senner excepts are precisely the half which are very objectionable *per se* on several grounds.

First, those who have been in the country before are, with few exceptions, 'birds of passage" who have been here not once merely, but several times; who came here to live for a time under degraded conditions at a low wage and soon carry their savings back to Italy. The fact that they migrate back and forth, instead of being in their favor, is a proof that they have no wish to assimilate and to permanently settle here; that they came here not to help build up the country, but to earn a few dollars. They have few wants; they make but a slight demand for commodities; they live in a way in which no American, German, or Irishman would live for a day. Of the recent immigration only 10.8 per cent. were women.

Consider next those going to join their immediate families. Perhaps this implies intention of settlement with some, or it may only mean that they go for work where they already know some one. If the latter, it is but a slight guaranty of permanent settlement; if the former there is clear evidence of the danger of increasing the enormous congestion in our Eastern cities, and especially in the slums of those cities which some of their countrymen have already helped to produce.

This should dispose of the exception in favor of this latter class which Dr. Senner would make in an educational test. Dr. Senner himself admits that illiteracy is invariably coupled with a low standard of living. Shall we make a dangerous exception to a wise test, or shall we ask the very reasonable and moderate favor that intending immigrants shall learn to read and write?

(4.) It is not true that "our immigration laws offer the fullest opportunity to any community or public institution burdened with immigrants who have become public charges within one year after landing, to rid themselves of them." Of 320 cases of sick poor relieved by the Massachusetts State Board of Lunacy and Charity last year, not over one-third could be identified so as to be turned over to the United States for deportation. The immigrants give false names and false statements as to the date and steamer on which they arrived, and often they are obliged to change their names for business purposes. There is no sure way of identifying them. The very fact that only 177 persons were returned by the United States in 1895, instead of showing how effective the law is, proves its total inadequacy in this particular.

Personally, I do not believe that boys who have to be shut up in Italian lunatic asylums for insanity produced by longing for the United States, would have been desirable immigrants.

(5.) Until some effective means can be devised for diverting Italian immigration to the West and South, we want no large body of Italian laborers. The Hebrew societies have spent large sums trying to settle Hebrew immigrants away from large cities. The experiment was a failure. Distribution can be effected only by voluntary migration. As to the other remedies suggested, our schools are already overburdened trying to assimilate the foreign born; and restrictions of the suffrage can be obtained, as Dr. Senner well knows, only after long agitation for constitutional amendments, and when most of the evils have been done. It is no protection whatever against social degradation. The burden should be put upon the immigrant of fitting himself to be a desirable settler.

Finally, there are many competent to judge who will not agree with Dr.

Senner that the bulk of recent Italian immigration is desirable. Eighty-six per cent. have no occupation; 68 per cent. are illiterate; 95 per cent. are destined for New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. But my chief purpose is to show some of the respects in which Dr. Senner's article is likely to mislead.

PRESCOTT F. HALL,
Secretary of the Immigration Restriction League.

THE TAXATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

MAN, as a social being, requires something beyond the coercive authority of civil statutes to impress upon him that obedience to moral obligation so necessary to the existence of all society and government. The object of our laws is the preservation and enforcement of right, but such is the imperfection of all human institutions, that there is a limit to municipal law, a boundary beyond which it cannot safely go; and passing which, it loses all its efficacy.

Positive law cannot extend to the correction of private vices of individuals, yet it is manifest that, unless such vices are suppressed, the peace and order of society must be seriously impaired, and good government impossible. This desideratum is supplied by the Church. Thus the Church is coadjutor of the State. It is as necessary to good government as the governmental organization itself. Hence it appears that the imposition of a tax upon church property would be almost as injudicious and quite as absurd a proceeding as the taxation of government property.

Such a course would be not only unwise but unjust. If churches were taxed the burden of taxation would fall, not upon a soulless corporation (as some have erroneously supposed), but upon the individual members thereof, who pay all expenses of maintenance. Churches are incorporated only for the purpose of convenience in their management. No person can be said to own church property in this country. It is usually held in trust for church purposes only. The individual places his money in this investment in obedience to what he conceives to be a holy duty to God, to himself, and to all mankind. He does not reap, nor hope or intend to reap, any pecuniary profit therefrom. Under such circumstances it would seem contrary to a spirit of right and justice to tax these properties. It would make religion a costly and expensive thing. It would operate to deter men from entering religious organizations. It would be contrary to the spirit of our law, as well as to the letter of twenty-four of the American constitutions, and numberless statutes of the various states.

Churches are not money-making institutions, and religious associations are not formed for private gain. These organizations are not alone for the spiritual benefit of their members, but for the moral elevation of all mankind. A church is a strong moral force in any community. Some of the largest eleemosynary institutions of the world are maintained solely by churches and religious societies. If these institutions were not so supported the government would be obliged to do it, for it is the moral duty of every government to care for its indigent, afflicted and insane. By disabling the promoters of these beneficent enterprises the government would simply add another expense to its own account.

Persons should be subject to taxation for the support of government, in the proportion in which they are respectively benefited by such government.

That which adds to the stability of government and chiefly conserves the public weal, and upon which the state is largely dependent for its own security, should, from motives of reason and sound policy, be exempted from the burdens of taxation, when it can practically be fostered in no other way. Government owes a greater debt to religion than does the latter to the former. Religion thrived and flourished, when society was in a state of anarchy, but no government ever existed without some form of religion. Moreover, in the earlier ages of civilization, those who were most active in support of religion were always found among the principal advocates of good government. What power but the church could have established the "Truce of God," which, during an age of war and bloodshed, restored peace to Europe at such frequent intervals as to render perpetual warfare no longer possible? The charge that the mediæval clergy were supporters of despotism is refuted by Hallam in his *History of the Middle Ages*, and the same learned author remarks the impetus given by Christianity to the formation of civic institutions. The early Christians were the first to successfully oppose the galling tyranny of the Roman Empire. Lord Bacon denominates religion the chief band of human society, and the very derivation of the word itself shows that it was so considered by the ancients; *religion* being derived from the Latin *religio*—binding back the hands, meaning, evidently, a restraint.

The principles of the Christian religion are conducive to good government, the morals thereby inculcated redound to the good of society, and, by reason of its humanizing tendency, and that extended scope of sympathy which flows from a sense of brotherhood with all mankind, it has ever been a most potent factor in facilitating the forces of law and order, a fact recognized by the greatest commentators upon political ethics and jurisprudence. Blackstone, in the Fourth book of his *Commentaries*, states that "Christianity, as a national religion, is, abstracted from its own intrinsic truth, of the utmost consequence to the civil state"; and further, that "Christianity is part of the laws of England."

Montesquieu (*Esprit des Lois*) says: "Let us set before our eyes, on the one hand, the continual massacres of the kings and generals of the Greeks and Romans; and, on the other, the destruction of people and cities by those famous conquerors, Timur Bey and Jenghiz Khan, who ravaged Asia; and we shall see that we owe to Christianity in government a certain political law and in war a certain law of nations, benefits which human nature can never sufficiently acknowledge. . . . The principles of Christianity deeply engraved on the heart would be infinitely more powerful than the false honor of monarchies, than the humane virtue of republics, or the servile fear of despotic states."

The learned Guizot has observed, somewhere in his *History of Civilization in Europe*, that individual reason was more boldly developed in the church than in any other society; and, indeed, none can deny that many of the severest intellectual disputations that ever engaged a champion in the field of human polemics, originated among the students of the cloister. M. Guizot also enumerates Christianity among those forces which have had a principal share in the promotion of civilization.

Dr. Lieber recognizes the salutary influence of Christianity, and its beneficial effect upon society.

But a further review of the authorities upon this subject would be supererogatory. That the present admirable state of society and government was brought about more through Christianity than any other agency, none

can successfully controvert; that the church is the strongest and most extensive moral organization in existence none will attempt to deny; that it is the greatest moral teacher in the world to-day does not admit of doubt.

Religion and law must go together, for if there were no moral force behind the law its mandates would be worthless. Good laws are always desirable, but never valuable unless they can be enforced; and they can never be enforced unless there is an honest, law-abiding spirit among the people. The law cannot make good citizens. It can only regulate their conduct after another power has brought them into being. The generality of mankind do not understand that it is always best to obey the laws of their country; hence the frequent attempts to evade them and the penalties thereto annexed. At this point the church comes to the assistance of the state. If a man follow the precepts of Christianity there is little likelihood of his being aught but a good and law-abiding citizen.

Animated with a supreme love and solicitous regard for the young Republic of which he was taking official leave, the great Washington, in his Farewell Address, did not forget to say: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

Without the restraining and wholesome influence of Christianity a large percentage of the people, especially those who are altogether unlearned (an element which comprises no inconsiderable portion of our population), would relapse into the most vicious immorality, thus forming a state of society in the highest degree incompatible with our form of government.

It has been affirmed by some, and not without great force of reasoning, that the government should tax the people for the support of religion, as is the case with many nations (notably a majority of the South American republics, and some European monarchies); or that provision be made, as in the Constitution of Connecticut, for the taxation of members by their churches for church purposes. Indeed, almost any course would be preferable to that suggested by the advocates of church taxation. The government certainly stands in as great need of religion and religious morals as it does of many other branches of education; and none will question the advisability of rendering governmental assistance to the promotion of literary and scientific achievement, even though it frequently result in vast expenditure of the public money, with no adequate recompense. And this, too, when it is well known that the arts and sciences nearly always bring financial gain to those who pursue them, while religion does not.

I would not go to the length of advocating the levy of a tax for church purposes by governmental authority, for it is meet that Church and State should ever maintain an inviolable separability; yet, to go to the opposite extreme of taxing church property for governmental purposes, would, it seems to me, be most unwise and indiscreet.

SPEED MOSBY.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXVIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

FROM A SILVER TO A GOLD STANDARD IN BRITISH HONDURAS.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, SIR ALFRED MOLONEY, K. C. M. G., GOVERNOR OF BRITISH HONDURAS.

APPRECIATING that the financial transactions connected with a change of standard which is unique in the history of currency, and the consequences of such a new departure, must be of general interest and concern, I have ventured, with some hesitation, in response to an invitation with which I have been honored by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, to illustrate my experience of the substitution of gold for silver in the Colony of British Honduras.

During the latter half of 1892 a feeling of popular concern manifested itself in the Colony in connection with the general condition of the silver market of the world and its local effect on exchange and trade, and in regard to the purchasing power of the dollar in that metal which had depreciated to such an extent that many were hit hard, particularly those dependent upon fixed incomes and wages. This concern assumed activity in the form of an earnest and enthusiastic movement in favor of a gold standard. The chief causes for the change advocated may be briefly summarized as the decline of the public credit, the instability of the value of the standard dollar as measured in terms of gold, with its alarming and embarrassing depreciation, the abnor-

Copyright, 1896, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

mal and fitful rate of exchange and the consequent derangement and uncertainty of trade. Thus prevailed a constant worry and a bewildering uncertainty which resulted practically in the conversion of legitimate trade into speculative gambling; as can be appreciated when it is known that the value of the Guatemalan silver dollar, the local standard, varied no less than fifty per cent. within eighteen months.

In 1891, the purchasing power of the "sol" equalled 72 cents, gold; at the time of the establishment in October, 1894, of the new standard, it was represented by 50 cents, net, above which it has not been quoted since.

With no direct cable connection and with an exchange rate continually varying, calculations as to prices were conjectural; goods had to be figured capriciously in anticipation of a fall, whether one occurred or not, or at a rate ruling at the time of importation; and when sold, as was frequently the case, at a credit of six months or more, serious loss was often experienced. Consequently, traders were dazed, imports decreased, selling prices had to be constantly readjusted and greatly advanced and the main burden fell upon the consumers whose income, whether fixed or as wages, had not correspondingly increased. These became discontented and irritated with the exporters, who were the few persons who really made money during the period, as they worked with the depreciating, and realized in the appreciating, money. Enterprise was discouraged. Sales of property were suspended. As material had chiefly to be imported, builders fought shy of contracts, as they never could tell how they would come out. The shrinkage of the value of the "sol" meant corresponding loss to most and had a most demoralizing effect, tending to destroy prudence and thrift. Progress under such circumstances was impossible.

Change of currency being among those questions which are reserved for the consideration and approval of Her Majesty the Queen before legislation effecting it could take take form, the Home Government were memorialized and the prayer of the people to have a gold standard, and that the dollar of the United States of America, was heard; and the principle of a state issue of notes against gold was accepted. It was also allowed to the Colony to have its own token silver coinage. The enactment of the necessary legislation in the form of "The Coinage Ordi-

nance" and "The Currency Note Ordinance" followed. The former demonetized the then existing currency; provided for its redemption within a specified time at a prescribed rate, which was 50 cents to the dollar, determined by a committee of experts appointed for the purpose and representing the ratio of the new to the old currency which ruled at the date of the change; erected the gold dollar of the United States of America into the standard coin of British Honduras, and made the gold coins of the United States Mint legal tender for the amounts of their respective denominations in standard dollars, as well as the British sovereign and half sovereign for the amounts of $4.867 and $2.433 respectively; established for internal circulation in the Colony a subsidiary coinage at par with gold which comprised fifty cents, twenty-five cents, ten cents and five cents silver pieces and the bronze cent piece current at the time; fixed $10 as the limit of legal tender in silver and 50 cents for mixed metal or nickel coins; and continued "accounting" in dollars and cents.

The latter law provided for the establishment of Commissioners of Currency, and authorized, as an additional subsidiary currency, the issue against gold by them of a colonial paper currency, in notes of one, two, five, ten and one hundred dollars, and any multiple of one hundred, as legal tender to any amount, and fully secured.

The amount of gold, notes, and silver in the new coins requisite to effect the change having been imported, the period fixed for the redemption of the demonetized dollar was October 15th, 1894 (when the ordinances referred to came into operation), and six days thereafter, exclusive of Sunday; but, in deference to the public interests and convenience, the time was extended to the 27th of October.

During the specified period the old money tendered in amounts of fifty dollars and under was exchanged at the prescribed rate for the new currency. For larger amounts deposit receipts were given and cashed within one month after date of issue.

The demonetized "sols" received in the Treasury were shipped out of the Colony and sold for what they were worth, the amount realized being used to pay for the purchase of the money that was substituted for them. Only about one-third of the number of the dollars demonetized has had so far to be replaced by the Colonial token money, the difference having been made

up by notes which, circulating on the credit of the government and being convertible on demand into gold, serve now, as far as they go, all purposes of money and have the same currency as gold and silver.

As to the losses sustained by the holders of the displaced silver by reason of its depreciation, there was an unanimous opinion that they should be regarded as having already accrued; and there was no attempt made at the time to suggest that they should be tampered with by legislation. What was sauce for the goose was accepted as good for the gander. A desire manifested itself to have existing contracts completed by payment in the old currency. It was, however, made clear that a secondary currency, which the acceptance of such a view would have involved, would in most cases be productive of much inconvenience, notably in the case of open accounts in which moneys would be due upon the date of demonetization. An automatic conversion of such existing and running debts from the old into the new currency was acknowledged by many to be free from hardship, and to have the merit of simplicity and finality.

As regards the treatment of outstanding liabilities at the time of the change, it was desired by some that the settlement of debts and contracts expressed in the then silver should be fixed for the day of maturity, and allowed in the "sol," or in its gold equivalent at that date, and at the ratio of conversion to be arrived at by the local treasury. Such a proposal was viewed as an endeavor to deal selfishly and piecemeal with the question, some of its advocates being doubtless solely influenced by the hope that the value of the then existing currency would go up to their individual benefit at the time of the settlement.

The only advantage that could be hoped for from this course would be that the parties concerned might possibly be restored, by further violent fluctuations in the old currency in the direction opposite to what experience showed to be likely, to a position approaching that which obtained at the date of the contract. Such an advantage would have involved in any event a loss to one party; it would not have applied to ordinary debts due at the time; it would have been limited to comparatively few transactions; and finally it would have been greatly counterbalanced by the complications and difficulties which would inevitably have arisen from the legislation of the circulation of two opposition

currencies of different values, the one comparatively fixed, the other ever fitful. After careful consideration it was, however, decided that they should be converted into obligations in terms of the new currency according to a rate of exchange approximating as near as possible that actually ruling at the date of the change of the system. It was appreciated at the time that, whilst the principle involved was open to some objection, it could hardly be said to involve more probability of unfairness to one of the parties than to the other, and that on the grounds of equity and convenience it was the best.

Moneys that were payable after the commencement of the Coinage Act under and by virtue of any contract, judgment, order, transaction or dealing made or entered into before its operation, or under and by virtue of any testamentary instrument, and that would have been payable in the old money, had there been no change, were legally made payable at the prescribed rate of exchange in the new coins. In addition, the requisite steps were followed and measures adopted, as soon as sufficient experience of the effect of the change justified action, to adjust, as far as was deemed necessary, to the new order of things the customs, excise, and license duties and other taxes, fines, fees of court, and any other dues or payments, affecting the local government, which were not sufficiently dealt with otherwise.

The gold standard has now been established nearly two years, and on no occasion has it been found that there is more silver subsidiary coin than is required. On the contrary, it has been, since, in constant demand and never at a discount; which may be accepted as proof that there is no redundancy of circulation.

So as to secure effectively and at all times the free convertibility of the silver token coinage into gold, as the best proof of the thorough soundness of the change, it was necessary to keep the issue of the former within strict limits, illustrating the bare requirements of the people as regards their small change.

Some anxiety, which subsequent experience has proved to have been groundless, was entertained at the time of the change of the currency, that there might accumulate in certain hands the new silver to an appreciable amount, and that the holders would be disadvantageously placed as regards making their remittances abroad if it were not convertible at the treasury, to an unlimited amount, for gold. Should later experience and an ex-

pansion of the Colony's domestic requirements clearly demonstrate an insufficiency of its token money, there will be no danger in increasing it, if provision be made for its convertibility into gold, should occasion require it, which will prove to be the most effectual check against any over-issue.

The greatest care and vigilance have been and must necessarily continue to be exercised to maintain the current value in exchange of the token money and the proportion brought into circulation had naturally to be limited in relation to that of the superior currency, the note issue, and gold, of which it represented proportionate parts.

Under the circumstances it was thought, at the time of enacting the ordinance respecting the coinage, to be unnecessary to provide therein for the conversion into gold of the subsidiary silver money requisite to effect the change.

Fears were entertained when the question of currency reform from time to time attracted public attention that a sudden change in the standard might seriously disorganize the industries of the Colony and such disorganization would be much greater, it was thought, were an attempt made to set up an artificial and entirely new standard. No such anticipations have so far been realized ; they were chiefly entertained by those who desired the continuance of the old currency from interested motives for their own individual benefit. A few with no interested motives conservatively wished to adhere to the old state of things. Not a single closure of any commercial house, the failure of whose business can be associated with the change, has occurred. The staple industry, logwood, has increased. Increment is also anticipated for mahogany and fruit this year ; in 1894-5 operations of cutting had to be contracted on account of fall in price of the former.

Not only has trade considerably expanded, but there has been an appreciable increase, over forty per cent., in the number of importers since 1894. Formerly, the smaller importers did their business through the larger houses ; it is so no longer. Any healthy widening of the basis of commerce by the creation of additional independent traders of varied interests must be to the ultimate advantage of any country. Competition has become keener to secure trade, which has had the tendency to reduce prices. From the agricultural backwardness of the country, due

to various causes, local produce for home consumption has not gone down to the prices that should obtain; but competition should in time effect reduction.

The laboring classes, the backbone of the Colony, have largely benefited as regards wages, the dollars now earned equalling the number formerly received by them in "sols." Savings Bank deposits have increased. Land and house property, whether in town or country, has increased one hundred per cent. in value, commanding now in gold the same amount received formerly in the money it replaced.

This increased prosperity has also been reflected in the vital statistics of the Colony, as is illustrated by the marked improvement* in the birth rate and the lowering of the death rate, and this improvement has been steadily maintained since. The marriage rate, which is accepted as a good index in other countries, cannot be relied upon here, for reasons not germane to the article.

During the whole of last year ninety days' drafts on England were at $4.80 to the pound sterling, a few bills being sold during the summer at $4.82, and during the Christmas season some at $4.75 on account of a slight fluctuation in supply and demand; drafts on the United States have generally been at par, though occasionally sold at a discount and some at a premium of one-half or one per cent.; ninety days' drafts on England bought here at $4.80 have frequently sold in the United States at $4.86 per pound sterling, showing a profit of over one per cent., which admitted of the larger commercial houses accommodating the smaller with exchange at par.

The sale of bills is no longer a monopoly nor the capricious thing it was. Accommodation has ceased to be a favor and has become a matter of business.

As regards the local treasury transactions since the change, bills of exchange at ninety days on England have been purchased by the government at $4.75 to $4.82 to the pound, an average of $4.78 for the pound sterling, resulting on realization in a profit.

British Honduras being co-terminous with silver-using coun-

*The birth rate of a population furnishes a good index of prosperity when read with other matters. Indeed, some vital statisticians go so far as to state that "a high birth rate is the invariable concomitant of prosperity." Farr's *Vital Statistics*, p. 3.

tries and having trade connections with others, "sols" find their way, as was to be expected, into the Colony. Although it is clearly understood that there is no legal obligation to accept them and that recipients hold them on their own responsibility, they are taken at their gold value as an accommodation in commercial transactions between buyer and seller, and exported to be realized in gold. There is no fear of their again affecting the silver position of the Colony.

It is not so however with the silver of the United States, which, although not legal tender, has crept into and mingles freely with the legal currency of British Honduras, being taken freely by the merchants, but at their own risk. It was introduced, soon after the change of the standard, by the fruit steamers from the United States to meet their requirements, and it is now as readily received as the token money of the Colony. Consequently, there has been no equivalent displacement or drainage of gold for export as was thought by some to have taken place. Nothing but legal tender coins will continue to be received by the government.

Nevertheless, it must not be overlooked that the silver dollar, with its component parts, of the United States, circulates here at an artificial value, that intrinsically it is worth less than the Mexican dollar which had to be demonetized in British Honduras, and that an English sovereign would purchase about nine of them outside of the United States. In connection with its local circulation, the greatest vigilance must continue to be exercised; true, so long as silver in the United States is maintained on a par with gold, the former could always be exported there without serious loss; but, should it be otherwise, what then?

The dominating question here has been for years the currency problem; it has been coquetted with and never seriously faced for various reasons into which it is unnecessary now to enter. It can be fairly claimed that the facts notified in this article demonstrate that a satisfactory settlement of the much vexed question, Currency, has at last been arrived at. Public credit re-established on a sound basis has been repaired and enhanced. Stability and rate of exchange equalling these obtaining in any country have been secured. There is reason no longer for hesitation to invest capital; before, capitalists naturally shrank from putting money into a country where a barometrical

money value and rate of exchange existed. Now gold is paid for in gold and the country's products are worked and realized in gold ; in fact, a money has been established which is of the same value to every one whether payer or payee. Unquestionably the change has been so far a valuable boon to the Colony, and it may be reasonably anticipated that it will prove to be a still greater one in the future.

The subject has been approached and handled with care, prudence and forethought, and all are to be congratulated who contributed to the unquestionable success of so delicate and exceptional a financial revolution. So far as I have been able to gauge its effect, the new currency has been received and accepted with general satisfaction ; even the few who silently and selfishly opposed its establishment now appreciate that the spasmodic gain they acquired formerly from the depreciation of silver is incomparable with the stability of the rating of exchange now assured, the sense of security enjoyed, and the material benefits derived from the gold standard.

ALFRED MOLONEY.

ARE THE FARMERS POPULISTS?

BY JOHN M. STAHL, SECRETARY OF THE FARMERS' NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

He who thinks that the farmers of this country are not in favor of sound finance and are more favorably disposed towards a depreciated currency than are the rest of our population, does them an injustice, and must have forgotten or misinterpreted a consistent chain of facts in our political history. Of the two principal political parties now in existence, it may be said broadly, but none the less accurately, that the Republican party has stood for safe and sound finance and the jealous upholding of the national credit, while the Democratic party has championed measures for a depreciated currency and the debasement of the national credit. Equally prominent is another fact: the strength of the Democratic party has been in the cities, while the farmers have been the strength and support of the Republican party. New York State is a striking illustration of this. The Democratic majorities have been in the cities; from the farms have come the votes that made majorities for the party that has stood for a sound currency and the strictly honest discharge of every financial obligation, private or public. Why, then, should the farmer, more than other classes, be accused of susceptibility to financial heresies, and of a disposition to debase our currency? His vote shows the very opposite.

The fiat-greenback heresy furnishes such a striking parallel to the present demand for the free coinage of silver that it will be instructive to recall the chief events of its course; and, in fact, this is necessary to any proper consideration of the farmer's attitude towards financial problems, and the campaign of 1872 is such a close parallel to that of 1896 that it may well have our careful study.

The sentiment in favor of a partial repudiation, at least, of the war debt was strong immediately after the close of the Civil War. Naturally enough, the element that had opposed the national government in its war measures, including those to provide the necessary financial means, was now ready to advocate the repudiation, in part or wholly, of the debt contracted to preserve the Union, and this element was strengthened by the currency-contraction policy of Mr. McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury. At that time President Johnson was the head of all the elements opposed to the Republican party, and in his annual message to Congress in December, 1868, he declared that "the holders of our securities have already received upon their bonds a larger amount than their original investment, measured by the gold standard. Upon this statement of facts it would seem to be but just and equitable that the six per cent. interest now paid by the government should be applied to the reduction of the principal, in semi-annual instalments, which in sixteen years and eight months would liquidate the entire national debt." The opposition to the issue of greenbacks, when such an issue seemed necessary to the continuance of the war for the preservation of the Union, had been led by Mr. Geo. H. Pendleton, of Ohio; and in 1868 Mr. Pendleton was again the leader of the Democratic party in its policy as to greenbacks, but he and that party now entertained such a radically different view of the greenback that they proposed to use it altogether in payment of the public debt. "The same currency for the bond-holder and the plow-holder," was the cry of the Democrats. It will be seen that they made the mistake of appealing particularly to the farmer for support in their assault on the national credit and honor. The rivalry between Mr. Pendleton and Mr. Chase led to the nomination of Mr. Seymour, but the Pendleton element wrote the platform adopted by the convention that met in New York city, July 4, 1868. The boldest, most positive declaration in that platform was that "all the obligations of the government, not payable by their express terms in coin, ought to be paid in lawful money." The Republicans took direct issue with this position. General Hawley, the permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention, in his speech on taking the chair, used the most emphatic language in declaring that the national honor must be kept unstained. "For every dollar of national debt the blood

of a soldier is pledged. Every bond, in letter and in spirit, must be as sacred as a soldier's grave!" he exclaimed, and the Convention broke into prolonged applause. The platform was not less forcible, and was more specific in declaring that every obligation of the government must be discharged honestly and in good faith. "The best money for the bond-holder and for the plow-holder," said the Republicans. Governor Seymour made a tour as far west as Illinois, closing only with the national canvass. He made many addresses. He was a most skilful and captivating orator. The chief topics of his speeches were the cost of government and the burden of taxation. How did the farmers respond to his seductive appeals, that on the one hand magnified debts and taxes and on the other hand offered easy means of paying debts and a smaller tax burden? *Every agricultural State gave a majority for the Republican ticket.* And the Democratic vote was strongest in the cities, the Republican vote in the country. New York city gave Seymour 60,000 majority; the rest of the State gave Grant 50,000 majority. In Philadelphia, the Democrats had a small majority at the October election, but the rest of the State gave a Republican majority of 10,000, which was considerably increased in November. The election was uncomfortably close. Only the large farmer vote decided the issue against repudiation and for honest finance and national honor.

In his inaugural address of March 4, 1869, President Grant took strong ground in favor of upholding the national credit. "Let it be understood," he said, "that no repudiator of one farthing of our public debt will be trusted in public place, and it will go far to strengthen our public credit, which ought to be the best in the world." The first act to receive his signature (March 18, 1869) was the act "to strengthen the public credit," which pledged the government to "the payment in coin, or its equivalent, of all obligations, notes, and bonds, except those wherein the law authorizing the issue stipulated that payment might be made in lawful money, which simply meant legal-tender notes." It did not receive a Democratic vote in either the House or the Senate. The arguments of the Democrats now are remarkably like those employed by Mr. Thurman, Mr. Bayard, and Mr. Garrett Davis, in opposition to the act, before the Senate in March, 1869. The refunding acts of July 14, 1870, and of August 20, 1871, provided for the refunding of the public

debt in bonds, all of which were made payable in coin. The payment in coin was persistently resisted by the Democrats, but the acts became laws by the votes of Republicans in the House and the Senate and the signature of a Republican President.

Thus the issue continued to be clearly defined and events were taking shape for the campaign of the next year. The conditions then existing were remarkably like those now prevailing. The Republican party, the friend of the greenback to such an extent as the necessities of the war made its use justifiable, refused to put it to a use that would have violated good faith and tarnished the national credit. The Republican party, that has shown its friendship for silver by coining more of it than have all other political parties combined in the history of this government, now refuses to coin it under conditions and to an extent that would violate good faith and tarnish the public credit. Two years before, in 1870, there had originated and in the intervening time there had developed an intense personal hostility to President Grant among certain members of his own party; two years ago such hostility to President Cleveland originated and has since increased. President Grant was accused of grasping powers that did not belong to the Executive; of responsibility for an alleged dangerous centralization of power in the national government; of unwarranted participation in the affairs of State governments; of being arbitrary; of allowing personal likes and dislikes to have too much influence in appointment to office; of using political patronage to influence legislation, and of growing rich more rapidly than is becoming to the Chief Executive. The hostility to President Cleveland within his own party originated in the same charges. In 1872, as in 1896, there were Republican "bolters," who put protection, the cardinal principle of the Republican party, in a secondary place—the "Liberal" Republicans declaring in their National Convention at Cincinnati that the tariff question should be remitted to the people in their Congressional districts; and the Republican bolters in 1896 have acted on the ground that protection is unimportant compared with silver coinage. It will be noted, also, that in 1870-2 as in 1894-6 the President and the element in his own party opposed to him were at odds on tariff legislation. The real originators of the "Liberal" Republican movement were all free traders, and President Grant was as much opposed to their tariff views as

President Cleveland was to the Wilson bill. The "Liberal" Republican Convention denounced repudiation and demanded the speedy return to specie payments, thus taking grounds on the money question directly opposed to that occupied by the Democratic party up to that time; and at its National Convention that year the Democratic party adopted the platform of the Republican bolters. In 1896 the Republican bolters take grounds on the money question opposed to that previously occupied by the Democracy, and the Democratic National Convention again adopts the financial platform of the Republican bolters. In 1872, there were defections from the Democratic ranks as there are in 1896, claiming that the mass of the party, and not they, had ceased to be Democrats. In 1872 Grant was nominated with great enthusiasm on the first ballot; and, for the first time since, the Republican National Convention this year nominated a candidate for the Presidency on the first ballot, and with great enthusiasm. There was an even more marked likeness in the condition of the public mind. Times were hard and the people were filled with unrest. In his "Twenty Years of Congress," Mr. Blaine says:

"When the Forty-second Congress met in December, 1871, specie was going to Europe at the rate of $66,000,000 per annum, and the balance of trade for that fiscal year was running against the United States to the amount of $183,000,000. It was a period of financial theories. The prejudice against national banks seemed to increase, and the *fiat* of a government so rich and powerful as that of the United States would, it was maintained, suffice to make all the notes it might put out available as money, and the volume ought to be abundant enough to stimulate every nerve of production and trade."

How has all this reappeared in 1896, even to the overestimate of the power of the fiat of this government to make value! Then the export of gold, the adverse balance of trade, and the distrust of the national credit were the direct results, and the hard times, the popular unrest, and the large brood of financial heresies the indirect, but certain, results of an unwise readjustment of the tariff, leading to insufficient national revenue; and the same cause is responsible for the same results to-day. Business men clearly saw then that it would be impossible for the national government to make good its promises to pay, to uphold the national credit, if such conditions continued, and the result was a distrust culminating in panic and deep financial depression.

For some years previous to 1872, there had been a clamor for reduction in duties. It was declared that the receipts of the government were too large. How familiar has all this been made to us since! Congress responded to the popular demand. The act of July 4, 1870, reduced the revenues of the national government $70,000,000 a year. The acts of March 5, May 1 and June 6, 1872, made a further reduction of $65,000,000 per year in the national revenues. The result was inevitable. Like conditions have like effect on the credit of individuals and of nations. If a man or a nation would retain financial honor and be prosperous, one as well as the other must have enough money to meet the just demands of creditors.

As the campaign of 1872 progressed, the Republicans stood more and more for increased revenue and a jealous regard and substantial measures for the national credit. The Republicans had passed the credit-strengthening act and the refunding acts, against the solid opposition of the Democracy, and stood by those acts. The Democracy, adopting the anti-repudiation platform of the "Liberal" Republicans, not because it expressed their convictions, but in an ignoble hope of winning an election and gaining office, drifted more and more to their old position, and before the close of the campaign stood for the fiat greenback heresy. Again the same issue, and the same conditions and divisions confront us this year. How did the farmers vote in 1872? Read, and know how they will vote in 1896. As in 1868, *every agricultural state gave the Republican national ticket a large majority.* Mr. Greeley had been very popular with the farmers. He had been an oracle to many of them. Perhaps no other man in our history has enjoyed such a closely personal popularity among the farmers of this country. But this popularity availed him naught, when a vote for him meant a vote for national discredit. The farmers turned from their old and once trusted friend and voted to pay the national debt in coin and not in fiat-greenbacks.*

*In 1872 the vote was: New York State—Greeley, 387,282; Grant, 440,738. New York County—Greeley, 77,814; Grant, 54,667. Kings County—Greeley, 38,108; Grant, 33,969. Ohio gave 37,531 majority for Grant, but Hamilton County, containing Cincinnati, gave a majority for Greeley, notwithstanding its large German population and Greeley's views on sumptuary legislation. Kansas, very nearly a purely agricultural State, gave more than two votes for Grant to one for Greeley. Michigan, another purely agricultural State, did very nearly as well. Illinois gave nearly four votes for Grant to three for Greeley, and Cook County, it must be said, did even better than the State; but Peoria, Adams, and Sangamon Counties, containing the three largest cities in the State after Chicago, gave majorities for Greeley. Minnesota gave more than three votes for Grant to two for Greeley, but Ramsey County, containing its largest city, gave a majority for Greeley. Iowa gave very nearly two votes for Grant to one for Greeley, but Lee, Dubuque, and

Mr. Blaine was one of the most accurate political observers and analysts this country has produced. He was well aware that it was not the country, but the city, that made the stronger demand for dishonest finance. To quote again from his monumental work:

"The Forty-third Congress met in a period of discouragement and disaster. . . . The situation gave fresh arguments to the champions of the *fiat* dollar. . . . A large proportion of the business men, especially in the West and Southwest, believed that an increased circulation of notes would bring great relief."

Note that it was not from the farmers, but from the business men, that, according to the Speaker of the Forty-third Congress, came the clamor that led that Congress to raise the limit of United States notes to $400,000,000. President Grant vetoed the act. The act for the resumption of specie payments was passed by the Senate December 21, 1874, and by the House January 7, 1875, the Democrats in both branches of Congress voting solidly against it. It was promptly signed by the President, who accompanied his approval of the act with a special message, in which he recommended *an increase of the revenues*. Congress heeded this recommendation and passed the bill approved March 31, 1875, "to protect the sinking fund and provide for the exigencies of the government." Thus the seat of the disease was reached. The last fierce fight for the "rag baby" was made in Ohio in the fall of the same year, and not even his great personal popularity among the farmers availed "Bill" Allen—the original "Populist"—and he was defeated. The next year the fiat-greenback heresy had so few supporters that when the Greenback national party nominated the justly popular Peter Cooper for President he could poll only 80,000 votes in all the country. This was the fiat-greenback strength until, not the farmer, but the city labor unions favored it, and developed the Labor Greenback party which, in 1878, polled a million votes. Not on the farms, but in the cities, were the fiat-greenbackers!

The fiat-greenback idea of the seventies, reproduced in the nineties as the fiat-silver idea, and both founded on the assump-

Scott Counties, containing three large cities of the State, gave majorities for Greeley, while such purely agricultural counties as Osceola gave 302 votes for Grant to 9 for Greeley, and Lyon gave 87 votes for Grant to 1 for Greeley. Nebraska, a purely agricultural State, gave 70 per cent. of its vote for Grant. Wisconsin gave Grant a handsome majority, although all its counties casting more than 3,000 votes, with one exception, gave majorities for Greeley. The vote of 1868 exhibits exactly the same proof that the farmers made the Republican majorities.

tion that this government is strong enough to nullify monetary law, and in opposition to all other nations—this idea, Mr. Blaine pointed out, gained greatest acceptance among business men of the West and Southwest. Because the unsound money sentiment has been strongest in these agricultural sections, it has been generally supposed to belong to farmers more than to other classes. Such a supposition, natural to those content to accept surface indications, would not be entertained by such a man as Mr. Blaine. As the people of the West and Southwest have been and are borrowers rather than lenders, compared with the people of the East, it is but natural that propositions to pay debts easily should find more favor in the West and Southwest than in the East; but, as Mr. Blaine observed, and as their votes eloquently testify, farmers are less disposed than are other classes to support the financial heresies that hard times always incubate. The same superficial, mistaken observers that conclude that farmers are in favor of sound money, because unsound money theories find most favor in the West and Southwest, also hold, and as incorrectly, the farmer responsible for Populism. Yet, in the greatest agricultural states of the Union, Populism has scarcely been tolerated by the farmers, and the Populist party has made a respectable showing only in the towns and cities. Iowa now disputes with Illinois the honor of being the greatest agricultural State in the Union. What figure has the Populist party cut in Iowa? In Illinois the Populist vote has been nearly altogether in the towns and cities, Chicago alone furnishing more than one half the Populist vote of the entire State. In the other great agricultural States, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, etc., Populism has cut no figure.*

*In Illinois the first Populist ticket was voted on in 1894. The Populist vote of the entire State was 59,793; of Cook County, 33,966—more than one-half. Citizens of Chicago, and other cities and towns, and not "the long-whiskered farmer," were the Populists. In 1892 the People's party ticket received only 2.54 per cent. of the vote in Illinois. In Indiana it received only 4 per cent. of the vote; in Iowa, an agricultural State, only 4.65 per cent. of the vote, although Weaver of that State headed the ticket for President. And the vote shows that very few of these votes were cast by farmers. A Populist ticket appeared in Michigan first in 1894. It received 7.57 per cent. of the vote. In 1895 the Populist ticket received 7.2 per cent. of the vote. In Missouri the Populist ticket received 6.88 per cent of the vote in 1894, and 8 45 per cent of the vote in 1895. A Populist ticket was voted first in Wisconsin in 1894. It received 6.81 per cent. of the vote. A Populist ticket was voted first in Ohio in 1895. It received 6.29 per cent. of the vote. Even if farmers cast all the Populist ballots in these agricultural States, it would be far from the truth to call farmers Populists; but an analysis of the vote shows that farmers, even in these agricultural States, cast less than one half of it. The farmers of no other State have been maligned as have those of Kansas. They have been unmercifully ridiculed and abused for being Populists. Yet not they, but the townspeople of Kansas, are the Populists. Take the flood-tide Populist vote of 1892, when the State gave a majority for

Why, then, attribute it to the farmer? To do so, stamps one as either pitifully incompetent and shallow in his observations and judgments, or wilfully dishonest. Instead of being what they are so often pictured to be, the farmers are the most sensible, substantial, and patriotic element of our population, and have never failed to uphold by their votes or their lives the honor and glory of the nation. Instead of receiving recognition and praise from those whose enterprises they have saved from disaster, their action has been persistently falsified and they have been paid only with vilifications and taunts and ridicule of their occupation and their personal appearance from those whose interests they have defended. Maligned and abused and ridiculed, they have kept the faith! In all the history of our country, no other class has shown by its votes such a sublime devotion to principle as have the Republican farmers!

To hold farmers responsible for Populism is not a greater mistake than to suppose that farmers are influenced in their currency views by hostility to city people and their interests. Tens of thousands of farmers' daughters are in the cities, not only as wives of successful men, but the flower of the stenographers, clerks, and teachers there, and the love and pride of the old folks at home. Nearly all of them have deposits in savings banks. I have the honor to know four farmers' daughters, skilled stenographers, diligent workers, honest and virtuous girls, that by using one large room for parlor and bedroom, by preparing their own meals in addition to the hard work of the office, and practising other economies, have each been able to save several hundred dollars, deposited in a Chicago savings bank. Their fathers and brothers would guard those hard made savings almost as they

Weaver—for which the farmers were most loudly cursed. The largest percentage of votes in opposition to the Populists was in the extreme western counties, purely agricultural, without cities—the counties in which nine-tenths of city people think a practically solid vote for the Populist ticket was cast. Here are the votes of these counties: Garfield, Republican, 102; Populist, 69; Finney, Republican, 478; Populist, 338; Greeley, Republican, 241; Populist, 114; Hamilton, Republican, 253; Populist, 186; Haskell, Republican, 177; Populist, 111; Hodgman, Republican, 363; Populist, 223; Kearney, Republican, 219; Populist, 141; Morton, Republican, 106; Populist, 26; and so on, while such counties as Leavenworth, Sedgwick and Sumner, having cities and towns, gave majorities for the Populist ticket. These western counties did even better in 1894, the Republican vote is given first: Finney, 492, —254; Gray, 173—98; Greeley, 175—81; Hamilton, 187—93; Hodgman, 287—152; Kearney, 199—27; Morton, 67—37; and so on. These farmers, on their lonely farms, poor in all but a sublime courage to vote their convictions, had not many votes to give, but as they gave them two to one against the Populists, who will say that they are not like the widow's mite and are greater than the thousands of the counties having towns and cities which heaped up the Populist vote? Since they cast their votes righteously, shall it not be counted unto them for righteousness? Yet for their work at the polls they have received only misrepresentation and ridicule.

would guard the good name of those girls. There are tens of thousands of other such girls having savings bank deposits. Can any one that knows the farmer think for a moment that he would favor legislation that would take away nearly one-half the value of those deposits—legislation that would be indeed "a crime"? Farmers' sons are the large majority of the successful business men—manufacturers, merchants, bankers—of the cities; who that knows them can believe that the fathers and brothers on the farm will vote hurt to the boys in the city of whom they are so proud.

Farmers understand the interdependence of industries. They know that any policy, whether it relates to the tariff or the currency, that reduces the output of factories and the business of merchants, must lessen the purchasing capacity for farm products; that any measure that banks furnace fires and lowers the wages of workingmen must lower the prices of beef and wheat and wool. As a shrewd business-man as well as patriot, the farmer would have every spindle hum, a merry fire at every forge, and every workman's pail well filled. He agrees with the silver monometallist that our great need is more money in circulation, but he believes that to get more money in circulation we must have, not more activity at our mints so much as increased production of our factories under a protective tariff and more confidence in our financial integrity. There is as much money in circulation in the country to-day as there was in the years immediately preceding 1893—years of unexampled prosperity—save the gold called across the sea by the fear of foreigners that we will reach a silver basis and the gold hoarded at home because of the same fear in this country. The money still exists, but it is not circulating as the life blood of trade because unwise tariff legislation has stricken down American industry and created distrust, and because those that have much of our money fear that if they pay it out for stocks or bonds, or loan it to manufacturers or merchants or investors, they may have to receive in payment scarcely more than one-half of its value. What we need to get more money into circulation is not so much more money coined as a greater demand for money to pay wages and the restoration of confidence in the money that we have.

JOHN M. STAHL.

AMERICA'S DUTY TO AMERICANS IN TURKEY.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE HON. JOHN SHERMAN, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OHIO.

BY THE REV. CYRUS HAMLIN, D.D., FOUNDER OF ROBERT COLLEGE, CONSTANTINOPLE.

To the Hon. John Sherman—

Dear Sir: Your illustrious name and illustrious services to the country give great weight to every utterance of your deliberate opinions. With regard to the imperilled missionaries in Turkey, you have said: "If our citizens go to a far distant country, semi-civilized and bitterly opposed to their movements, we cannot follow them there and protect them. Any act of war by us would be accompanied not only by the murder of the missionaries, but of their converts or sympathizers."

Being myself one of the missionaries implicated, and having members of my family—children and grandchildren—still residing in the Empire, having been connected with the Turkish work since 1837, and having resided thirty-five years in the Empire, and being now past the meridian of my eighty-sixth year, will you consider it presumption in me to correct, from my own experience and knowledge, some of the errors into which, from want of intimate knowledge, you have inadvertently fallen?

And, first of all, I did not go into "a country semi-civilized and *bitterly opposed to our movements*," but into a country well known and thoroughly explored, and having many aspects extremely favorable and inviting to missionary effort. Messrs. Fisk and Parsons, in 1820, explored the country of the Seven Churches. Messrs. Fisk and King ascended the Nile in 1823. And before 1827 the missionaries Parsons, Fisk, King, Bird, Goodell, and Smith had explored Palestine and Syria and carefully reported

the condition of those countries as calling loudly for Christian missions. In 1827 Mr. Gridley travelled from Smyrna to Cappadocia, in Asia Minor, and reported the condition of the country. In 1830 Messrs. Smith and Dwight made a long and careful tour of research, extending from Constantinople through Asia Minor and parts of Mesopotamia, Russia, and Persia. Their report, published in two volumes,* declared the Empire open to Christian missions; not to the Moslems, but to the old and decayed Christian churches, Armenians, Greeks, Nestorians, and others.

Missions had long been established by Roman Catholics, and opposition might be apprehended from them, of course. The land journey of 2,400 miles had been made in safety, as had all the journeys above referred to. No opposition was made by the Turkish government, and none was apprehended in the establishment of missions; and, for more than half a century, none was experienced.

In the meantime, reforms were going forward. The great Sultan, Mahmoud, had broken with the past, had destroyed the Janizaries, and had openly declared that the welfare of his Empire depended upon cultivating right relations with Christian powers and with the Christian subjects of his Empire. He was especially friendly to Americans. When his old-fashioned Turkish fleet was destroyed at Navarino, he employed American naval architects, Eckford and Rhodes, to build a far better one. He treated them with distinguished consideration and personal regard.

When the young Sultan, Abdul Medjid, wished to promote the cultivation of cotton in his empire, having doubtless an eye to the more profitable use of the many useless slaves, he applied to the United States government for aid. The result was that Dr. Davis, of South Carolina, was sent with a few slaves and a model cotton plantation was established at San Stefano. The enterprise failed through no fault of Dr. Davis, who was decorated and handsomely rewarded. A much wiser and more successful scheme was the development of the mining resources of the empire. Again Abdul Medjid, applied to our government, and Prof. J. Lawrence Smith, a gentleman of great scientific attainments and of special skill in chemistry, an author and inventor, accepted an

* New York, Jonathan Leavitt, 182 Broadway, 1833.

appointment. He made many valuable discoveries, one of which, an emery mine, is of value to the government to this day. When he presented Morse's telegraph to the Sultan, I was invited to assist him. The Sultan said to me, "I hope you find your residence at my capital a pleasant one," and he added many other kind things. After two trials of the telegraph in his palace, he sent to Professor Morse his first foreign decoration, with a framed diploma, in excellent Arabic, addressed to him as "The most learned of the Disciples of Jesus." Americans were specially honored.

In 1830 a treaty was formed between the United States and the Sublime Porte in which was the "most favored nation" article; and as Roman Catholic missionaries had been there for more than a century under the protection of the government and especially patronized by France, our missionaries entered unchallenged and asking for no favor not already accorded to others.

When the great Mahmoud died in 1839, his son Abdul Medjid ascended the throne and immediately issued the historic paper called the Hatti Sherif of Gul-hané, as a new constitution for the administration of his power. Under that, missionaries had all the rights and privileges they could ask or wish. They came and went freely; schools were established; the Bible was translated and printed in all the languages of the Empire, and freely sold.

In 1846, the Sultan authorized the formation of Protestant Armenian churches, although there was an earnest opposition from Roman Catholic and Russian sources. In 1847 he reinforced the permit by a Vizerial order and in 1850 by an imperial firman. The work of the American missionaries thus received the highest sanction of the supreme authority of the Empire. You were under a grave misapprehension of facts when you intimated that we went into "a country semi-civilized and *bitterly opposed to our movements.*" Of course, Roman Catholics and Russians were not friendly to us: but they were not "the country"!

The history of our educational "movements" proves further your great misapprehension of our position as missionaries. In 1840 I opened the Seminary, or Normal School, at Bebek, on the Bosphorus. It continued there prosperously for more than twenty years. When, afterwards, I wanted to establish Robert College, and the combined and powerful opposition of the Russian and

French diplomats prevented my building, I opened the college in the buildings of the Bebek Seminary—that institution having been transferred to Marsovan. The government absolutely refused to disturb me there.* The seven years' restriction upon building was caused wholly by French and Russian interference. The visit of Admiral Farragut changed the tone of things, and leave was magnificently given. Since then seven other colleges have been established, under the authority chiefly of Abdul Aziz, the predecessor of the present Sultan Hamid.

More than forty seminaries or normal schools and young women's boarding schools have also had the full approbation of government. Many unmarried ladies have been teachers in these schools, and have safely gone back and forth into the distant interior, under the protection of the Turkish government. I plead, therefore, not guilty to the charge of entering a semi-civilized country bitterly opposed to us and leaving members of my family there where our government is under no obligation to secure the rights of American citizens. On the contrary, it was an exceptionally safe and inviting field of labor. More than 400 missionaries, men and women, have given their lives to that work during the past 75 years, and many are buried in Turkish soil.

Another point in your utterance is worthy of remark: "Any act of war would be accompanied not only by the murder of the missionaries, but of their converts and sympathizers."

By "an act of war" you evidently mean the shedding of blood. But when, in all this century, has this been necessary, or been resorted to, in defending the rights of foreigners in Turkey? All the nations of Europe protect their citizens in that Empire without any such "act of war"! They have often made a show of war, by ordering up a war ship, or ships of some kind; and this has always been sufficient. Many years ago, England had a case against Athens which was not attended to; and she sent some of her warships to close the Piræus; and the affair was immediately settled. England sent two of her warships into the Gulf of Smyrna to settle a local dispute between English and Turkish interests. The Turks immediately took the English view of the case, and there was no further trouble. Turkey has many exposed points, such as Smyrna, Mersin, Alexandretta, Crete above all; and she would do almost anything rather than have any one of

* See "My Life and Times," 433-437.

these ports occupied by foreign war vessels with a demand. She keeps her own navy up at anchor in the farthest practicable interior of the Golden Horn, where alone her ships can rest and rust in safety.

Had our country defended the treaty rights of her citizens, as all the nations of Europe have defended theirs, the massacres that blot with innocent blood the last pages of the century would never have been perpetrated, as I shall briefly show.

The present Sultan, Hamid, came to the throne with an inveterate dislike to all Armenians who would not apostatize and thus follow his mother's example. He began his career by displacing them from office. Many hundreds of them were in various offices of government. He next began to oppress their schools with new and vexatious requirements and to spoil their school books by an absurd censorship. Many schools were closed, many school-books destroyed for containing forbidden words, such as "courage," "patience," "patriotism," "progress." In this work he encountered our schools, school-books, and teachers, and began cautiously his war upon them. He has destroyed our school-books printed and issued by the authority of his government and owned by Americans, an invasion of rights perpetrated upon Americans alone. Our government was often appealed to for redress, which was generally promised in the sweetest and most gracious words, of which our diplomats have been very proud. But no penalty was ever exacted, no promise was ever fulfilled, excepting the case of Mr. Bartlett's house, in which the moving force was the threat of an ironclad. Now every outrage thus treated during the last few years has been a distinct permission to go on to greater outrages upon property and personal rights. The Sultan has seen that it is a safe thing to perpetrate every indignity upon Americans and their property, until now the destruction of American property has amounted to nearly $200,000. Not one dollar would have been destroyed had our government from the beginning protected our rights as all the governments of Europe protect their citizens.

It must be remembered that the destruction and the looting of the buildings at Harpoot, Marash, and other places were done in the presence of government officials and troops, and the plea "done by a mob" cannot be accepted.

It must also be remembered that every building destroyed had

been built in strict accordance with all the laws of building; their plans, measurements and proposed uses had all been laid before the proper authorities and received their sanctions. The government in destroying such buildings and looting them of all their contents of furniture, food and clothing has gone back upon itself in its eagerness to show "its contempt of America and Americans." In all this the Sultan is backed up by Russia. No indemnity has been exacted, or if any demand has been made it is understood that some high Russian diplomat whispers that now is not the proper time to enforce it, and it is dropped. Thus the "Great Republic" is justly the derision of other nations and cowers before a poor Sultan who cannot pay a piastre of his public debt, nor make the smallest loan in the money markets of Europe.

No Turk has yet been punished for robbery, pillage, murder, rape, rapine, torture unto death of women and children, and the horrid work still goes on. Why should it not? The nations, our own nation especially, have for two years been giving the Sultan *carte-blanche* to do as he pleases; and his pleasure is the extermination of all Armenians who will not Islamize, the expulsion of the American missionaries, the destruction of their property, and the showing of himself as superior to all treaties and to all the claims of truth, justice, and humanity towards all men of the Christian faith.

Having now vindicated myself, as I believe, and also my associates in Turkey, from the suspicion of having done anything to sacrifice our right to the protection of our government, I would most earnestly appeal to you to use your great influence to right the wrong which our government has done us, to rescue us from impending destruction. We claim only the treaty rights of American citizens. The missionaries in the field have shown their readiness, if need be, to suffer unto death rather than forsake, in these scenes of blood and torture, the people to whom they have given their lives. Lead, we pray you, the Great Republic, to stretch out her arm for their protection. Secure from the Sultan the rights accorded to other nations, and the blessing of those who are ready to perish will descend upon you.

I remain, with profound respect and admiration, the humblest of your fellow citizens,

CYRUS HAMLIN.

WOMAN'S BATTLE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

BY THE REV. PROF. W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.

THE great advance in the position of women that has taken place in the British islands within the last few years is due to two great causes, which may be distinguished by a recent parliamentary phrase as non-contentious and contentious. In some departments women have risen without noise or struggle; in other departments they have made good their progress only by war *à outrance*. But in both cases the progress has been made mainly through the same cause; through individual women of rare gifts and courage showing what they are capable of, what gifts they have, and what power to use them; this being followed by the double result of cutting off from opponents their chief ground of objection, and of encouraging less courageous women to venture into the arena, show their capacity, and claim their due.

It is to the contentious department—the region of opposition and struggle—that we wish chiefly to draw attention; but a glance at the more silent and unopposed line of progress will fitly introduce the other.

Foremost in the department of quiet progress, we place literature and kindred arts. A century ago, there was hardly a distinguished female name in all English literature. Hannah More was one of the first to venture into print. Among her contemporaries were Joanna Baillie, Maria Edgeworth, Jane Austen, Frances Burney, and Mary Wollstonecraft, whose *Rights of Woman* made her doubly a pioneer. But to the class of literary ladies before the Victorian era one might apply the famous line of Virgil, with the necessary change of gender:

"*Apparent rarae nantes in gurgite vasto.*"

Within the last fifty years, however, female writers have become thick as leaves in Vallombrosa. It is in the lighter departments of literature that they chiefly appear—poetry, fiction, stories for children, essays, letters, and sketches ; and here they probably equal in number the whole array of contemporary male writers. And some of the names are stars of the first magnitude. Mrs. Hemans, Mrs. Browning, Christina Rossetti, Mrs. Alexander, George Eliot, Miss Braddon, Mrs. Oliphant, Miss Martineau, the Brontës, Miss Carpenter, Mrs. Jameson, Mrs. Charles, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Edna Lyall, and others form a constellation as brilliant as the Pleiades. Nor is light literature their only field. In science Mrs. Somerville led the way, commanding universal respect for the grasp and fulness of her scientific purview. More recently, Miss Ormerod's contributions to natural history have gained her the post of Entomologist to the Board of Trade. Miss Giberne's *Sun, Moon, and Stars,* with the imprimatur of Professor Pritchard, of Cambridge, has been received with remarkable favor, and reached a circulation of between twenty and thirty thousand copies. Miss Buckley's *Short History of Natural Science* takes a kind of encyclopedic grasp of modern scientific progress. Even in the border land of philosophy and theology, Miss Caillard's *Progressive Revelation* shows an interesting mastery of modern speculation without the sacrifice of steadfast faith. As travellers, some ladies have shown wonderful courage and capacity, notably Isabella L. Bird, now Mrs. Bishop, who began her literary career many years ago with *The English Woman in America,* and her fame as a traveller with her *Six months in the Sandwich Islands* and *Letters from the Rocky Mountains.* There is every reason to believe that when Girton and Newnham have reached maturity, the contributions of women to the higher departments of literature and kindred arts will become more and more numerous and important.

It would be an interesting inquiry : What has been the net result of the thousand and one contributions to our literature that have recently flowed from female pens ? Have they in any way modified the tone of English literature ? Have they given it more grace and purity ? Or have any specific results arisen from works having a definite practical aim ? Upon that wide and somewhat difficult inquiry we cannot enter now, but all would readily allow that by far the most remarkable case of lit-

erary triumph with a specific aim has been on the western side of the Atlantic. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, in its influence on public opinion and public action, stands as yet unrivalled.

Philanthrophy is not a new field for women, for sisterhoods of charity and mercy have been from time immemorial. But in our day female philanthropy has assumed a new phase, and entered on a wider career. Instead of creeping about in veiled obscurity, doing good by stealth, and not finding it fame, women have come out as originators of great philanthropical enterprises, in which, after a time, they have commanded approval and admiration on all sides. Elizabeth Fry, in Newgate, introduced a new era of prison administration. With her three great gifts, according to her daughter Katherine, "her dignified and stately presence, her exquisite voice, and her unruffled sweetness of expression," she was a splendid pioneer. Almost by her single example she settled the question of woman's right, when duly gifted, to speak in public; for who, as the late Dr. Guthrie used to say, could hear her most melting appeals without being convinced such gifts as hers were meant to be used. Miss Nightingale, with her warm heart and ready hand, achieved a great revolution in the art of nursing. In her work among navvies, recorded by Miss Marsh in her *English Hearts and English Hands*, it was shown for the first time what a remarkable influence a cultivated and loving Christian lady could exercise on the most rugged of men—how wonderfully she could capture their hearts and mould their wills. Mrs. Bayly's *Ragged Homes and How to Mend Them* was a convincing testimony to the success of woman's work in the slums. Miss Annie McPherson was the pioneer in the rescue work that has transferred tens of thousands of children from neglect and misery at home to a career of honesty and prosperity in Canadian homes. Other ladies without number in our day have made their names alike honored and fragrant by work among soldiers and sailors, by homes of rest, homes for cripple children, leagues of pity, sea-side resorts, fortnights in the country, cabmen's shelters, boys and girls' clubs, and a thousand other contrivances for lessening the burden and brightening the monotony of toil. Surely it was a great blunder in Mr. Dickens to make his Mrs. Jellybys and Pardiggles types of our active philanthropic women. For female philanthropy, as a whole, there is now but one voice of commendation and admiration, and if the kindly and gentle

spirit which has thus shown itself could only be brought to bear on certain other departments of labor, terribly exposed to the east wind, much might be done to overcome the antipathy of class to class and to hasten the day

> "When man to man the warld o'er
> Shall brithers be, for a' that."

But the course of true love has not run quite smoothly in female philanthropy. Besides showing mercy in their own way, women have presumed to claim a voice in the management of some of our great charitable institutions. They have actually sought to become guardians of the poor! Who can tell the virtuous horror of the fine old companies of managers and directors when it was proposed to give women a place on the Board of Guardians? Were they, men of business and men of brains, to be disturbed and worried by the fancies and dreams of ignorant, flighty, unpractical women, who could no more manage an institution than they could direct the movements of the British Navy? Bring in women, it was said, and you will bring in an utter chaos of disorder. But it began to be seen that in the case of the poor, half being of their own sex, the help of women might be of no ordinary use. Did men or women understand best how to feed them? And might not women have some reasonable ideas about clothing, and nursing, and managing the children; and if the old people were cranky and ill-tempered, might not women be as successful as men in soothing their irritations, and throwing a few gleams of sunshine into their lives? Was it strange that such views prevailed? It is but yesterday since Miss Slack and other friends began to fight this battle, yet already nearly a thousand women are guardians of the poor in England, and doubtless the number will rapidly increase.

But the effort to make women eligible as guardians of the poor was a mere skirmish. The great tug of war has been in connection with other objects, notably these three: higher education generally, and admission to the universities; medical education in particular, and medical practice; and the municipal and political suffrage, especially in the election of members of parliament.

But for these struggles the way was silently prepared, partly by the process, characteristic of all advancing civilization, which lays more stress on the individual, both in the family and in the

state, recognizing more fully individual responsibility and obligation:

> "For every creature, male as well as female,
> Stands single in responsible act and thought;"

and partly by specific efforts to impress the public mind with the rights and proper place of women. We have referred to Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, published in 1792, which made a stir in its time, but was not powerful enough to do more. To this we may add the erratic championship of Shelley, and the more effective advocacy of John Stuart Mill and Professor David Masson, buttressed by such powerful works as *Aurora Leigh*, *Shirley*, and Tennyson's *Princess*. Thackeray and George Eliot contributed to swell the stream, and more recent writers, including Charles Reade, George Meredith, and Thomas Hardy at home, and Tolstoï, Ibsen, and Bjornson abroad, have helped to make the atmosphere of public opinion more favorable than at any previous time to the claims of woman.

We proceed to trace the line of battle in the three directions that have been named.

1. *Higher education and admission to the universities.* It is a full half century since the desire arose to burst the envelope which had hitherto confined female education to a very small class of subjects, and obtain access to those richer fields of knowledge in which the other sex freely expatiated. The first formal step in this direction was taken in 1848, when the "Governesses' Benevolent Institution" made arrangements with professors of high talent and standing in society to open classes in all branches of female education, and for that purpose started an institution in Harley Street, London, known as Queen's College, followed in 1849 by another in Bedford Square, known as Bedford College. These institutions, however, were self-contained, nor had the idea arisen as yet of connection with any university. It was not till 1856 that any movement began in that direction. In that year, Miss Jessie Mariton White addressed a letter to the Registrar of London University, inquiring whether a woman could become a candidate for a diploma in medicine, if, on presenting herself for examination, she produced the requisite certificates of study and character. The opinion of counsel having been taken, the Senate replied that "they did not conceive themselves empowered to

admit women as candidates for degrees." Six years later, in 1862, Miss Elizabeth Garrett (now Mrs. Garrett Anderson) requested to be admitted as a candidate for matriculation, but with the same results; and a motion in the Senate to apply for modification of the charter of the university, making female students admissible to its degrees and honors, was lost by the casting vote of the Chancellor. Finding this too bold a game in the then state of public opinion, the friends of the cause endeavored to secure an intermediate position, hoping through it to advance to success in their higher aim.

What they now asked was liberty to pass the university local examinations which had just been instituted. To this request the University of Cambridge acceded under certain conditions. On December 4, 1863, the first examination was held and was fairly but not wholly successful.* But it was only a private examination, and the next effort was to gain the benefit of publicity, and the greater stimulus to exertion on the part of the girls which this would secure. The Senate so far agreed, but objected to making the names public. It would be altogether unsuitable in this brief paper to go into all the steps of the struggle, and the varied success it met with from the universities of London, Cambridge, Oxford, and Durham. But even where girls were granted a place in local examinations, it was found that this step was altogether insufficient to fulfil their legitimate aspirations. Many young ladies (as many schoolmistresses testified), desired to go much further than the standard of local examinations. A new movement was accordingly concerted. It was resolved to establish a girls' college that should hold in relation to girls' schools and home teaching a position analogous to that occupied by the universities towards the public schools for boys. The final result of this resolution was the establishment in Cambridge of the now famous colleges of Girton (1873) and Newnham (1875). Application was made and granted for the use of the examination papers used for the mathematical tripos and the classical tripos in the university. In 1872 one lady passed the examination for the mathematical tripos, and two for the classical. In Oxford, which was behind Cambridge, an association for promoting the education of women

* For details on this subject we are indebted to a pamphlet entitled *Women in the Universities of England and Scotland*, by Emily Davies (herself a pioneer in the movement), 1896.

was founded in 1878 and in 1879. Lady Margaret Hall and Somerville Hall were opened for the reception of resident students. Notwithstanding their concessions in the matter of examinations, these two universities have hitherto declined to take any steps for conferring degrees on women.

The University of London, which is not a residential institution, but a body for conducting examinations and conferring degrees, has advanced further. The question of degrees came up again, and after considerable discussion, "the Senate and Convocation agreed to accept from the Crown in 1878 a supplemental charter, making every degree, honor, and prize accessible to students of both sexes on perfectly equal terms." This was a great step in advance; but the old jealousy asserted itself in a provision of the charter that no female graduate of the said university should be a member of Convocation unless a resolution should be passed by the Convocation to that effect. On January 17, 1882, however, it was resolved by that body that "female graduates be admitted to Convocation."

In 1895, the University of Durham (which is of comparatively recent origin) became "mixed," a supplementary chapter having been obtained enabling the university to grant degrees to women in all the faculties except theology.

The movements of the universities, in this whole matter, have shown a remarkable conflict between opposing forces: the strong conservatism of ancient custom and privilege on the one hand, and the sense of justice and obvious popularity of the woman's cause on the other. Oxford, where the conservative spirit is strongest, has been the slowest to move; Cambridge, with its great liberalism, has been more responsive; while the two modern universities, London and Durham, have gone the whole length and placed men and women on an equal footing.

But what of the Scottish universities? We shall have more to say of them when we examine the movement for medical education; but, apart from that branch of the subject, where great opposition was shown, a favorable response was given to the desire for advanced female education. Edinburgh took the foremost place in opening its local examinations to girls in 1865. Four years later, a system of classes for women was introduced, taught by professors of the university, and a certificate, registered in the books of the university, was given to ladies who in any three or

more science or art subjects passed special examinations up to the standard of the M. A. degree. In Glasgow, similar steps were taken, and in 1883, the Association for the Higher Education of Women was incorporated under the name of "Queen Margaret College." In St. Andrews in 1876, the university instituted an examination and diploma for women with the title of L. L. A.

But what gave the greatest impulse to the cause in the Scottish universities was the Act of Parliament of 1889, which gave power to the University Commissioners to enable each university to admit women to graduation in one or more faculties and to provide for their instruction. The Commissioners issued an ordinance, which, on June 28, 1892, became law, making it competent to the University Court of each university to admit women to graduation and to make provision for their instruction within the university in any or all of the subjects there taught, either by admitting them to the ordinary classes, or by instituting separate classes for their instruction. This enabling ordinance is now in operation; and, though it has not been taken advantage of to the full, graduation has become possible; a considerable number of women are preparing for it, and on some degrees have been already conferred.

2. We turn now to what has been far the keenest and the fiercest campaign in this cause—the struggle for medical education with a view to medical practice. Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake's book, *Medical Women*, supplies us with the facts in this great warfare, in which she herself, with remarkable courage and persistency, bore the leading part. Her story of the battle is prefixed by a very interesting introduction in which two historical facts are very clearly established; that again and again in former times women practiced both medicine and surgery in various countries of Europe, and often with great success and *éclat;* and that the employment of male practitioners in midwifery cases is restricted almost wholly to the present century. Some of these medical women received the degree of M. D., and even of LL. D., from distinguished universities, and were held in great esteem by the whole profession.

In more recent times the first lady who received the degree of M. D. was an American, Miss Elizabeth Blackwell, who, after much difficulty, obtained it from a college in

the State of New York. The University of France has ever looked with a friendly eye on women, and it was there that the first Englishwoman who became an M. D., Miss Elizabeth Garrett, received her degree in 1870. The next was Miss Mary C. Putnam, an American lady, who quietly continued to pursue her studies in Paris during the two sieges in 1870 and 1871. The first Scottish graduate in medicine was Miss Agnes McLaren, who received the degree of M. D. from Montpellier in 1878.

But we are anticipating. When Miss Jex-Blake and other ladies determined to devote themselves to medical practice, it would have been natural to turn to one or other of the universities of Europe that would have been willing to receive them. But by a recent law, regulating medical practice in Great Britain, the diplomas of foreign schools would not have sufficed to place their names on the lists of legally-qualified practitioners. Even Miss Garrett, brilliant though her examination at Paris had been, could get her name on the register only in virtue of a license which she held from Apothecaries' Hall. Moreover, as the authors of the new movement were not fighting for their personal interest, but on behalf of their sex, and as it was obviously most desirable that medical ladies should obtain their degree from a source that was beyond cavil, it was resolved that their line of battle should be ordered, and all their energies directed, towards getting the medical degree from a home university.

Accordingly in March, 1869, Miss Jex-Blake approached the University of Edinburgh. A few of the professors were friendly, more were neutral, and a few bitterly opposed. One or two of the medical professors were so vehement in their opposition that it became apparent that no stone would be left unturned to defeat the purpose of the ladies. At first, however, the Senatus acted mildly, and passed a resolution which seemed to encourage female students of medicine, and four additional ladies came forward for the purpose. But afterward the Senatus recalled this resolution on the plea that it was found to be illegal, or beyond their power. This vacillation exposed them to very bitter criticism; at first they allowed the ladies to enter, and thereafter resolutely shut the door in their face.

We have no space to enter into all the details of the conflict with the university. Now the request was for matriculation; now

for separate classes for women, to be conducted by the professors or their assistants; now for leave to attend the ordinary classes along with the male students; now for relaxation of a rule that prevented them from taking more than four classes outside the university. As long as the university was favorable and allowed separate classes, all went well, and at the examinations the ladies distinguished themselves greatly, and one of them became entitled to a valuable prize. But this gave rise to a new element of opposition on the part of the students, some of whom gave vent to their jealousy in the most discreditable way, by personal rudeness to the ladies, and by offensive anonymous letters reflecting on their character. Out of this treatment arose an action for defamation brought against Miss Jex-Blake for declaring that a student who had treated her rudely was intoxicated at the time; after appeal the action was decided against her, the costs which she had to pay, or would have had to pay had friends not interposed, amounting to £915.

The enemies of the movement in the medical faculty of the university originated another law plea; they went into court to contest the legality of the concessions that had been made on behalf of the lady students. The decision of the Lord-Ordinary was in the ladies' favor, but the case being appealed to the whole court, a majority of the judges decided against them. This decision was given in June, 1873, and the ladies were again called to pay the expenses on both sides. As far as the university was concerned, its doors were now finally shut against them, and, as no other way of obtaining their object seemed feasible, they appeared to have suffered a total defeat.

While the struggle for admission to the university was going on, another pretty little battle of similar character was proceeding in connection with an application for admission to the Infirmary. Very naturally the ladies desired the opportunity of so much attendance at the Infirmary as would enable them to obtain the necessary certificate. They were willing to accept separate instruction if it should be thought impossible to allow them to go through the wards with the other students; they were willing to be limited to a mere fraction of the wards, if only they could obtain the certificate. If it should be objected that operations of a particular kind were unsuitable for ladies to witness, the answer was that the nurses witnessed them, and no one objected to

that. But again and again their applications were refused. At last, in 1872, by a small majority, the Court of contributors decided in their favor. Dr. Guthrie, who had always been on their side, was present—it was the last public meeting he ever attended. He said: "it seemed to him monstrous that when the country committed the fortune of the State to a woman's hand, women should not be entrusted with administering a dose of physic or preparing a blister."

Application to other universities, Durham and St. Andrews, led to nothing, and it became evident that an appeal must be taken to another tribunal. Parliament and the government were now appealed to, and not without success. But, in the first instance, a bill introduced on behalf of lady students was lost. The centre of operations was now transferred to London. A school of medical study for women was set up, and it was hoped that some of the nineteen Examining Boards that had authority to examine would accept the certificates of the school. But here again difficulties and disappointments arose, even though in 1876 an act was passed permitting these boards to admit women to examinations if they chose to do so. The case seemed as hopeless in London as it had been in Edinburgh, and as a last resource the ladies turned to Dublin.

And here at last they conquered! "The Irish College of Physicians was now (1876) prepared to recognize the London School and to admit women to examination on the same terms with men. Early in the following year," writes Miss Jex-Blake, "several of us who had already obtained degrees in foreign universities, were admitted to examination, and in this way, women, after an interval of twelve years, again found their way on to the National Medical Register." Arrangements were made about the same time allowing the ladies to attend a hospital in the neighborhood of their London School. Thus, at last, a path was made for ladies, first to prosecute medical study, next to attend a hospital, and finally to obtain authority to practice; and though many doors continued to be shut against them, they attained their object, in the main, and were enabled to rest, or rather to work, in peace. The Scottish Universities Act, to which we have referred, made things easier in Scotland, although it cannot be said that the sexes are yet on a level there.

It is worthy of note that one of the considerations that helped

greatly to recommend the movement was its bearing on the great Empire of India. Shut up in the zenana, Indian women are beyond the reach of male practitioners. It is said that on one occasion, when a male practitioner did have a female patient, she would show him her tongue only by making a hole in her veil. The prospects for women in India are now greatly brighter, so far as medical and surgical assistance is concerned, and the missionary societies are giving all encouragement to medical lady missionaries. And there is this to be said for medical ladies in India, that out of the many millions of women who may desire their aid not so much as one will have to dismiss a male practitioner.

3. We turn now to the *suffrage* movement. The battle here, though one of great interest, has not awakened the keenness of feeling that was shown in connection with medical education, for the obvious reason that no one has a personal interest in opposing the admission of women to the suffrage. In opposing the medical ladies, practitioners of the other sex often showed that they were not above the trades'-union feeling, as it was called; like the people of Ephesus, they deemed their craft in danger. But the question of female suffrage is free from all such complication. It is indeed a foregone conclusion, for it is not easy to say why a woman of property should be debarred from exercising the suffrage which her gardener, her coachman, and her tenants may all exercise. In point of fact, the women of Great Britain now exercise the municipal suffrage, the School-Board suffrage, the Board of Guardians' suffrage, and the County Council suffrage. Besides this, they are eligible on school-boards and boards of guardians, though not on town or county councils.

In 1892 a bill in favor of women's suffrage was defeated in the House of Commons by a majority of 202 to 179. It was introduced by a Conservative member, but the vote was not given on party lines. It is a somewhat striking fact that, though the movement is based on Liberal principles, it has much support from Conservatives. Lord Salisbury and Mr. Arthur Balfour have declared themselves in its favor, while the bill of 1892 was opposed by Mr. Gladstone, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Labouchere. The experience of the Primrose League leads the Conservatives to believe that female suffrage would operate in their favor. This, however, is only the accident of

the moment; it is essentially a Liberal measure, although it does not find a place in Liberal programmes.

In the last report of the "Central National Society for Women's Suffrage" (June 26, 1896), it is stated that the result of the last general election had been to increase the number of friends in Parliament and diminish that of opponents. Reference is made in the report to a recent memorial to the House of Commons which bore the signatures of 257,000 women, of whom 57,800 were Londoners, 140,700 English provincials, 51,270 Scottish, and 7,320 Irish. The signatures included the heads of nearly all the colleges for women, and a large proportion of the head-mistresses of high and other public schools for girls, and of women serving on boards of guardians and school boards. At the same time it was admitted at the meeting of the society that the movement had fallen into a state of langour, and that energetic measures were needed to quicken it into such a condition of activity as would secure its triumph.

As the poet says:

> "She who did this thing was born
> To do it; claims her license in her work,
> And so with other works. Whoso cures the plague,
> Though twice a woman, shall be called a leech:
> Whoso rights a land's finances is excused
> For touching coffers, though her hands be white."

We have no room in this paper to take notice of many of the lesser operations that illustrate the progress of the woman's battle. And we can give but a few concluding lines to the question: What is to be the result? Where is the movement to end? What is finally to be the position of woman and her relation to those pursuits that have ordinarily been confined to the other sex?

First, we may say that the arbitrary rule by which certain pursuits and studies were held to be fitting, and others unsuitable, for women, must now be repealed. In place of it we must recognize the rule that no office or employment can be held unsuitable for a woman who shows that she possesses the requisite gifts for it, and in practice fulfils its requirements well. As "manifested fitness" has been the sesame that has opened so many doors during the past generation, so it must be held to be equally applicable in days to come.

On the strength of this principle it must be held that no leg-

islative obstacle should be placed in the way of women to bar them out from employments for which they show themselves fitted; and that no social prejudice should be allowed to tyrannize where there should be a fair field and no favor.

But what will follow? A rush of women into all the professions, berths, and offices hitherto belonging to men? By no means. The strongest forces of nature will still remain to draw women generally in the old directions. A select few with eminent gifts will share important positions with the other sex, but the rank and file will find their place in the old spheres. It is well for women to know that marriage is not the only outlet for their lives, but marriage will ever continue to be the outlet for the great majority. "Love's young dream" will not be extinguished. The management of the household will ever be woman's peculiar care. Instincts not to be overcome will continue to draw them to occupations that are peculiarly suited to their strength and their tastes. The functions of maternity will still be surrounded with a charm of their own. It may be true that even in physical strength the woman may by training and exercise become the equal of the man. But physiologists all tell us that this can only be achieved apart from the functions of maternity. So long as she exercises these functions, her frame as a rule will be more delicate, her strength weaker, her features more refined, her manners more gentle. And these qualities will in some degree be imparted to her daughters. Nature will thus place her barrier against most of the occupations of the other sex. The female character will retain its refinement, its gentleness, and its grace. The divine rule, which has given to man the first place in the human family, will suffer no infraction; it will still be true that "the head of the woman is the man."

W. Garden Blaikie.

THE PLAGUE OF CITY NOISES.

BY J. H. GIRDNER, M.D.

MAN is entirely dependent on his five senses for all the knowledge he receives concerning the material world. The nerves which supply the organs of hearing, sight, smell, taste, and touch, or the tactile sense, are the only channels through which information with regard to objects of nature can be obtained; they are consequently the primitive source of all conscious relation with the rest of creation. Destroy these channels, or suspend their operation, and consciousness ceases, and the individual is placed precisely on a par with the vegetable kingdom. In fact, physical man might properly be defined as five senses mounted on stilts, and endowed with the power of reason and locomotion.

The impressions made upon the organs of hearing, sight, etc., are transmitted over their respective nerves to the sensorium as raw material, if one may use such an expression; and there they are transformed into sensations, prior to being reflected to other parts of the organism.

It at once becomes apparent what a vast influence the operation of the senses must exert on our mental, moral, and physical well being. It is also surprising how little care and thought are taken, not alone by the individual, but also by constituted authority, to protect these delicate organs from unnecessary irritation. Such neglect is especially manifest with regard to the sense of hearing, and it is this fact which brings me to my present purpose, viz.: to call attention to the painful and injurious effect of city noises on the whole nervous system, and to make such suggestions as a careful study of the subject seems to warrant. I do not wish to be considered an alarmist, or hypercritical, but it seems to me the time has come when something should be done to lessen

the constant and largely unnecessary outrages committed on the sense of hearing of the residents of large cities.

The deleterious effect of the constant shock or concussion of unpleasant and non-musical sounds on the auditory apparatus is demonstrated beyond question by the fact that nearly all boiler makers, according to the highest authorities on diseases of the ear, are hard of hearing. There is a well-recognized condition of congestion, amounting sometimes to inflammation, in the internal ear, which otologists class under the general name of *boiler makers' disease;* but this is liable to occur also, and does occur, in all classes of persons who are exposed, as the inhabitants of the metropolis of New York are, to the continual rattle, roar, and screams which assault their ear drums at nearly all hours of the day and night.

Professor Roosa, a world-famous specialist on diseases of the eye and ear, writing on the effects of excessive discordant sounds on the acoustic nerve, says: "That it must necessarily be as harmful to the nerve of hearing, as is excessive light to that of sight, is a natural deduction from our knowledge of the effects of the waves that produce these two senses, and all experience confirms the belief that there may be an acoustic neuritis produced by noise as well as optic neuritis caused by exposure to a glare."

The ceaseless assault of confused and discordant noises on the auditory apparatus is not confined in its destructive effects to those organs alone, but the brain and the whole nervous system are likewise made to suffer in consequence of it.

The act of hearing should not require attention. Under ordinary circumstances, no effort calling out consciousness of the operation is elicited. The vibrations, or sound waves, are conducted to the sensorium, where they are interpreted and duly considered. But when a Babel of discordant sounds and noises of every degree of harshness and force is poured into the auditory canals, an effort, indeed, is required to catch the sounds we wish to interpret, and to eliminate those which are not only of no consequence, but positively painful. This sustained effort of selection and elimination is an incalculable strain and source of exhaustion to our nervous energy. The fact that persons who live in the midst of confusing and discordant noises, as do the dwellers in large cities, become in time accustomed to them, is no

proof that the noises are any the less destructive and exhausting to the brain and nervous system. Such persons have only become expert in discriminating and selecting the sounds in which they may be interested at the moment.

The habitual drunkard can take large potations of alcohol into his system without its producing any of the ordinary signs of intoxication. He has grown accustomed to the effects of the stimulant; but does any one suppose, that for this reason, the injurious effect of the alcohol on the tissues of his body is any the less pronounced?

Observe the confusing and almost stupefying effect on the inhabitant of the way-back rural district when he visits the city for the first time. He is the butt of every joke, not necessarily because he has a faulty sensorium; in this respect he may be, and often is, far better off than those who laugh at him; his trouble is, that he has no skill in selecting and discarding among the million sights and sounds that rush in upon his consciousness.

There can be no question but that a vast amount of nerve energy is expended on the sense of hearing and discriminating noises in a city like New York. Add to this the wear and tear, the jarring and actual pain produced on the sensorium by the endless roar in which we live, and you have a most potent factor in the production of that bane of modern city life, neurasthenia or nervous prostration.

If the above facts are true for the well, how much greater are the deleterious effects of city noises on the sick. Recognizing the detriment to their patients from this source, most of our hospitals have succeeded in having asphalt pavement put down in the streets near them, and thus have secured some relief. But not all the sick are in hospitals; tens of thousands are sick at their homes, and except where they have sufficient "pull" to be allowed to put tanbark over the cobble-stones in front of the house, they must grin and bear the suffering and injury imposed upon them by the jarring sounds of the street.

Opposition to unnecessary noise and noise-makers, and the demand for reform in this respect, is not based alone on the annoyance they cause, though that would be quite sufficient to justify rebellion. The main ground of our contention is the broad physiological truth that rest is necessary to health, and that over-stimulation and irritation of the brain and nervous sys-

tem, whether it takes place through the auditory or some other set of nerves, is essentially disease-producing.

It is, of course, impossible to state exactly what part noise in New York city plays in the death rate and the sick list, but every physician knows it must be considerable. How often the physician in his daily rounds finds it necessary to prescribe "perfect quiet" in order that the flickering spark of life remaining in the patient may be brought back to a healthy flame. Yet in nine cases out of ten, that perfect quiet he deems so important cannot be had, owing to the noises from the street. Especially is this true in warm weather when windows must be kept open.

The makers of unnecessary noises in New York are not confined to any one class. All are more or less guilty, from the church people to the organ grinder and the street peddler. Any one who studies this subject and observes carefully will be astonished and disgusted at the reckless disregard of each for the health, peace, and comfort of all the others.

If you should go for a walk in Fifth Avenue on a fine afternoon and all sorts and conditions of people were to begin to assault you with switches, you would call the police; they would be promptly arrested and properly punished. What for? They have not killed you, or maimed you, or drawn any blood, and you are apparently none the worse for these assaults. What they have done is to irritate the nerve terminations of one of your five senses, viz.: that of touch, or the tactile sense, and through the nerves of this sense they have made you conscious of painful sensations. This is exactly the treatment you do receive from these same people, by their unnecessary assaults on another sense, viz.: that of hearing. But should you ask the authorities to interfere in this case, you would likely be arrested yourself, and your sanity inquired into. This remarkable inconsistency—the prompt protection of one of our senses from assault, and the utter disregard of another—seems almost unaccountable, except on the ground of custom and habit. It is simply another instance of patience and long suffering under abuse, for which the American public has become famous.

It is impossible to conduct the ordinary affairs of life in a city without producing a certain amount of noise. It is also true that a given disturbance produces a much louder and more penetrating sound in the city than it does in the country. The

high, continuous walls of the houses on both sides make the street partake somewhat of the character of a whispering gallery, and the sound waves reverberate from wall to wall, thus greatly increasing their power of penetration.

These facts are the strongest arguments in favor of suppressing the *unnecessary* noises.

The noises and noise-makers in New York City are legion. Some are necessary, some are partly necessary, and some are wholly superfluous, and should be treated as public nuisances.

The best way to study the city noises, it seems to me, is to divide them into groups.

1. Noises produced by horses and wheeled vehicles.

2. Noises produced by street peddlers, beggars, street musicians, etc.

3. Noises produced by bells, whistles, clocks, etc.

4. Noises produced by animals other than horses, as cats. birds, etc.

5. All noises which come from the inside of our houses, as persons learning to play musical instruments, training the voice, etc., etc.

6. Explosives.

Nearly every kind of city noise will find its proper place under one of the above headings. It would be interesting to study each individual in these six groups, and to point out which are necessary and which unnecessary, and to suggest the remedy in each particular case, but it would lead us far beyond the proper limits of a magazine article. I propose to select one or two examples from each of the groups for detailed study, and to make such suggestions as seem proper, and allow the reader to go on with the remainder of the group himself.

The first group, that is, noises produced by horses and wheeled vehicles, includes street cars, steam cars, elevated cars, and all kinds of carriages whether used for business or pleasure. These are largely necessary noises, but much can be done to lessen their annoying effect. Asphalt pavement on all streets is the one thing needed above all others. It is practically a noiseless pavement, or should be, so far as the carriage itself is concerned: only the clatter of the horses' feet is heard, and that must be put down as unavoidable until we get horseless carriages. Asphalt pavement in New York is, however, far from being noiseless. The old

loose cast-iron manhole cover, which appears at frequent intervals in the otherwise noiseless asphalted street, sends forth a sudden and ear-splitting sound every time a wheel passes over it. I know of no single source of noise that is so annoying, especially to the sick, as this one. This noise is wholly unnecessary, and there is no excuse for its continuance. Manhole covers, which are themselves asphalted and properly fitted to their frames, make a continuously smooth pavement, and are noiseless. These should take the place of the miserable old rattle-traps now used. This is, of course, the business of the Public Works Department.

The cartman who drives through a street with the body of the cart banging the shafts at every stride of the horse ought to be stopped by the police, and made to fasten the body firmly to the frame.

A few pieces of old burlap placed between the iron rails, when a load of that material is to be drawn through the streets, would prevent one of the worst brain-bruising assaults we suffer from.

The second group—noises produced by street peddlers, beggars, street musicians, etc.—are entirely unnecessary. These noise-makers should be treated as public nuisances. The few thousand engaged in buying and selling rags and bottles, watermelons, etc., have no right to disturb the peace and quiet, and to actually injure the health of the rest of the inhabitants of a city by hourly yelling their wares through the streets. No hardship could result to these people; for does any one suppose that the traffic in rags, bottles, watermelons, etc., would be injured by having it conducted decently and in order?

The mendicant, whose mournful cry for alms in the public street is so common and annoying, should be taken to one of the many institutions which public and private charity has so lavishly provided for such unfortunates.

As for the so-called street musicians, it seems that any din or clamor an Oriental or South Sea Islander chooses to call music is sacred, and must be accepted at par without a protest by the rest of us.

The third group, according to our arrangement, includes noises produced by bells, whistles, clocks, etc. These are nearly all unnecessary. Church bells and clocks were useful at a time when congregations were scattered, and clocks and watches were rare. But none of these conditions exists in New York in

these days. Watches and clocks are always at hand to tell us the hour for church and for business, and the sweet quiet of the Sabbath morning should not be disturbed by the clanging of bells on church steeples, nor should our sleep at night be disturbed by their clocks pounding out the hours.

Every citizen should be required to provide a box where his mail could be deposited and the shrill ear-splitting, useless postman's whistle should be abolished.

Noises produced by animals, such as cats, birds, dogs, etc., which constitute our fourth group, are unnecessary. Think of the vast increase in the aggregate number of hours of restful sleep that would be obtained by the inhabitants of this city if all the cats were removed from our back yards, to say nothing of the decrease in soul-losing profanity. An ordinance requiring all persons who wish to keep a cat to take out a license and keep said cat in the house, and all other cats to be removed to the pound, is all that would be necessary.

Noises from the inside of our houses comprise the fifth group. If the music teachers could be induced to take their pupils into the country to train their voices and teach them instrumentation, life for many would be all the sweeter. The well-to-do folks set a bad example. At a fashionable reception my lady's drawing-room becomes a pandemonium of shouting, screeching women, each doing her best to make herself understood.

The sixth and last of the groups is explosives. Let us be thankful that this torture is confined mostly to one day in the year, the Fourth of July. The day following our last national holiday, I called on a patient, a weak, emaciated, exhausted woman, who had for days been hovering between life and death. She was much worse than the day before, and I wish the City Fathers could have gazed upon her pale, weary, drawn face and heard the pathetic voice as she said: "I could not get a minute's rest yesterday nor last night owing to the noise in the street; every explosion seemed to be tearing the nerves from my body." And this was only one instance out of thousands. These Fourth of July noises in the city are not only unnecessary but are a gross outrage. If Young America must celebrate this day with explosives, make him get out of the city to do it.

To complain of abuses and to point out the remedy is not

enough to insure reform. The newspapers for a long time have called attention editorially and otherwise to the need of checking the reckless noise-makers. Letters from sufferers are constantly published calling attention to specific cases of unnecessary noise, but these efforts are sporadic. No concert of action or systematic crusade has been attempted to lessen the noises in New York city, and until that is done I see no hope of any improvement.

I believe the solution of the problem will be found in the organization of a society. Call it the Society for the Prevention of Noise. It should have a charter and certain powers and responsibilities conferred upon it by the Legislature. It should be modeled somewhat after the pattern of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or the Gerry Society. It should make a study of the noises of the city, and through its own powers, and by advice and coöperation with the various city departments suppress such noises as are unnecessary, and reduce those that are necessary to the minimum of disturbance. Such a work could not fail to be of immense benefit to the public both in the matter of comfort and health. And the last word on the advantage of a city of comparative peace and quiet cannot be said, until account is taken of the assistance such a state of things would render the individual in securing that inward peace which passeth understanding.

J. H. GIRDNER.

THE LATE SESSION OF PARLIAMENT.

BY JUSTIN M'CARTHY, M.P.

THE session of 1896 has been a season of surprises. The Tory government began with a magnificent majority in the House of Commons. Only one government in my recollection ever had so great a following. The normal majority of the Tory government amounted to 150. Here, surely, was a government which might go anywhere and do anything. In the ordinary course of affairs a Prime Minister thinks a steady majority of thirty a very satisfactory possession—a steady majority of fifty something to be proud of. But the Tory government started at the opening of the session a few months ago with their steady majority of 150, and what have the Tory statesmen made of it? They have made failure after failure; they have created clouds of confusion darkening their future path; they have spent months of barren controversy ending not merely in defeat but in utter discredit, not to say degradation, to themselves. Now, as they still can command on ordinary occasions their 150 majority, it is necessary to give some preliminary explanation of the causes which brought about such extraordinary results.

The fault was in the government itself, not in its stars. The government, to begin with, was composed of two discordant factions. There were the regular Conservatives, like the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Balfour, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; for I always regarded the Duke of Devonshire as Conservative, even when, being then Lord Hartington, he occupied a place in several Liberal governments. The other faction was that led by Mr. Chamberlain, who having begun in the House of Commons as a far-advanced Radical had left Mr. Gladstone on the question of Home Rule, and because he could not agree with Mr. Gladstone on the question of Home Rule had suddenly transformed himself

into a Tory, denounced everything that he had once applauded, proclaimed his intense satisfaction at being at last in the company of "English gentlemen," and finally accepted high office in the Tory government. Now there can be no doubt that Mr. Chamberlain has rendered great service to the Tory party. But for him they would in all human probability have failed in their effort to obtain hold of power just now. Still there was and is a great deal of grumbling in the Tory ranks about the liberality of the rewards which were given to Mr. Chamberlain and his followers. Mr. Chamberlain certainly did not do quite as much for the Tories as Coriolanus did for the Volscians, and yet we know that the friends of Tullus Aufidius grumbled savagely over the position allotted to the Roman renegade. Moreover, there is a feeling among the Tories that the demands or exactions will become greater and greater as the time goes on and the difficulties of the government increase. There, then, is one of the internal elements of discord corroding the strength of the government.

Another trouble is found in the personal attitude of Sir John Gorst. An American reader may not, perhaps, know much about this source of trouble, and I am therefore inclined to spend a few sentences in describing and explaining it. Sir John Gorst is at present what would be called in other countries the Minister of Education. He is a very able man—so far as my judgment goes, the ablest man in the Conservative administration. He was once a member of the famous Fourth party, which was started by the late Lord Randolph Churchill, and which consisted of four men, Lord Randolph Churchill himself, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, and Mr. Gorst, as he then was. That Fourth party worried the Tories just as much as they did the Liberals, and when for the next time a Tory government came to be formed the members of the fourth party had to be counted with. Lord Randolph was made Chancellor of the Exchequer; Mr. Arthur Balfour obtained some office which gave him a seat in the Cabinet; Sir Henry Drummond Wolff was made an Ambassador, and Mr. Gorst received some appointment which left him out of the Cabinet. He is not in the Cabinet now; he has never, so far, been in the Cabinet. Yet he is a man of great ability, as I have said, and he has a close knowledge of all questions concerning education, labor, and socialism; he has an open mind, is full of practical sympathy with the working

classes; is a man of wide and varied experience and is an excellent parliamentary debater.

Why, then, should the Tories not give him a position adequate to his deserts? Well, if you question them, or some of them, at all events, they will tell you frankly that Sir John Gorst is not a man easy to get on with; not a man on whom his chief can always rely at a crisis; that he is, in fact, a sort of gifted, high-minded "crank." There was a marvellous instance of this peculiarity a little more than five years ago. Sir John Gorst then delivered his famous, I might almost say his immortal, Manipur speech. He was Under-Secretary for India when a trouble broke out in one of what are called the protected states there; that is to say, the states in which England exercises a sort of protectorate. The actual, although not the titular, reigning prince of the state was accused of having stirred up a rebellion against the protecting power. He was tried, convicted, and promptly put to death. The whole question, was, of course, brought up in the House of Commons. The Liberal leaders charged the Tories with gross injustice in the putting to death of the prince. Their chief speakers insisted that the prince was very popular in Manipur; that he was an able, capable, and beneficent ruler, and that his people all resented his doom as an outrage. Sir John Gorst as Under-Secretary for India had to defend the policy of his government. How did he defend it?

The whole House listened in wonderment to his defence. I do not profess to give his exact words, but I do profess to give the genuine meaning of his speech. No doubt, he admitted, the prince was able, beneficent, and highly popular. No doubt he was a good ruler. No doubt his people loved him. But then, he went on to say, that is exactly the sort of man whom England could never tolerate in India. That is the sort of man who comes most awkwardly between us and our Indian policy. We could not put up with him. We are bound to put him down.

Now, to make the impression of this speech the more clear, I may say that every one who knows Sir John Gorst knows that his sympathy goes with the native races everywhere, and that his whole soul revolts against the injustices which are too frequently inflicted on them. Therefore, it became clear that Sir John Gorst, as Under-Secretary of State for India, was simply delivering a long, elaborate, and scorching satire on the policy of all

English governments in India. Nothing of the kind had ever been heard in the House of Commons before under such conditions. The speech gave rise to a new Parliamentary phrase. A man who openly in the House satirizes his own colleagues is said to be "Manipuring." Nothing of the kind was ever heard since in the House of Commons until the present session, when Sir John Gorst, as Minister for Education, turned upon and satirized and chaffed and flouted his own leader, Mr. Arthur Balfour, about the principles and the management of the Education Bill.

Now I, for one, do not believe that Sir John Gorst performs these strange freaks because of any feeling of resentment for the lack of appreciation shown towards him by his official chiefs. According to my impression, the truth is that the instincts of the natural man, the enlightened and liberal man, force Sir John Gorst now and then outside the limits of official discretion. He probably still thinks he is a Conservative, but I should say that he ought to be an advanced Radical. However that may be, it is certain that the one great failure of the session so far has been the Education Bill which it was the official duty of Sir John Gorst to introduce to the House of Commons. The government had the task of endeavoring to reconcile to their Education Bill three great parties or sects in the state—the hierarchy and members of the Anglican Church, the hierarchy and members of the Roman Catholic Church, and the English, Scotch, and Welsh Nonconformists. I am not going to ask my American readers to follow me into a detailed description of the measure. I only want to point out that the great question at issue was whether the schools endowed by the state for the poor shall be denominational or undenominational. That is, whether under any condition the State shall pay out of public funds for the religious instruction of the children of the different sects. The Nonconformists insist that the money of the state—that is, the money of the tax-payers—shall only be given to pay for those studies which are common to all denominations. Many of the Anglicans and all the Roman Catholics object to sending their children to schools from which religious teaching is excluded. They therefore form voluntary schools, and they demand that when the teaching of these schools is up to the government standard the schools shall receive as much help from the state as is given to the ordinary board-schools.

There, in substance, is the whole question. The government

undertook to deal with it in a measure which was proclaimed to be the great legislative scheme of the session. Now, one might have thought that on a question so distinct in all its bearings, so incessantly debated in public and in private during many years past, there ought to have been no great difficulty in finding out whether any compromise whatever was possible, and if so, what that possible compromise might be. Only after the measure had been introduced by Sir John Gorst did it seem to have dawned upon the minds of the Tory statesmen that if any compromise were possible, they at all events had got hold of the wrong notion of a compromise. The Nonconformists denounced the bill, the Anglicans were divided upon it, the Roman Catholics would not have the bill as it stood and would only consent to its being read a second time in the hope of altering it to something entirely different. The more the measure was debated the more the difficulties in its way came out. Many thorough Tories openly condemned the scheme. Sir John Gorst, as several papers said, took to "Manipuring again." As I have already told my readers, he satirized and scoffed at and flouted the chiefs of his administration. Mr. Chamberlain kept altogether aloof from the discussion. Mr. Arthur Balfour, when he did intervene in the debate, made things worse rather than better.

Mr. Arthur Balfour has disappointed in this session of Parliament all the hopes that had been formed of his capacity as the leader of a great party. Now, Mr. Balfour is a man very popular in the House of Commons. All of us who know him are charmed by his genial manners and impressed by his varied culture. But if he is going to be a great parliamentary leader he must entirely remodel himself from the Arthur Balfour of 1896. So far as I can guess, the truth is that he did not care three straws about the Education Bill. He is not a man likely to become absorbed in the details of a measure which has nothing to do with University or academic education, but is only concerned with the commonplace teaching of the children of the poor. I am convinced that when he spoke upon the measure in the House of Commons he sometimes did not know in the least or care very much what he was talking about. In this he was totally unlike Sir John Gorst. Whether the measure was a good one or a bad one, Sir John Gorst at all events knew all about it and understood thoroughly the purpose and the effect of every

one of its clauses. Moreover, Mr. Balfour is a dreamer rather than a worker. He takes to politics as he might take to any other form of occupation which amused him for the time. He cannot throw his soul into the details of dull and commonplace schemes of legislation. He is a philosophic doubter about everything, and especially about the House of Commons and parliamentary eloquence. I heard him once say that he had no high opinion whatever of mere oratory. He admitted that John Bright was undoubtedly a great parliamentary orator, but said that he should not care in the least to make speeches like those of John Bright. Now, if a man wants to succeed in any line of life almost the first condition is that he must greatly desire success in it. A man must give himself wholly to the House of Commons and its work or he cannot become a great parliamentary leader. Mr. Balfour never did give himself wholly up to the work of the House of Commons. His one great anxiety always seemed to be to get away from the House of Commons as often as he could and to go and do something else. He never, I am told, indeed I think he has said so himself, reads the newspapers. Now a man might be a great scholar who never read the newspapers; he might be a great power in literature without ever reading the newspapers. I may go a little farther and say that in some fields of literature a man might be a better worker because he never read the newspapers. But the man who undertakes to lead the House of Commons and to conduct the affairs of a great administration without reading the newspapers is like a man who undertakes to steer a ship without taking any account of winds and waves and stars and weather. When Mr. Balfour came to discuss the Education Bill he soon showed that he was out of touch with everybody, even including the members of his own Cabinet. He is a very clever and graceful parliamentary debater; he is, taken all around, one of the best debaters in the House of Commons, now that the one supreme debater has quitted the parliamentary field. But he showed to very poor effect in the debates on the Education Bill. What was the result? The result was that after weeks of precious time had been wasted in hopeless discussion, Mr. Balfour had to throw up the sponge and withdraw the bill. With all his great majority he could not force the bill upon the House of Commons. Had he persevered in trying to do so, a considerable number of his own men would have openly revolted against

him. He did not fall in battle. He merely quitted the field. No failure so utterly ignominious to a ministry has ever occurred in my time. More than half the session was occupied in fruitless, futile debate on this measure which was to have been the great triumph of the government, and which had to be unconditionally surrendered at the last.

The programme of the session was crammed full of measures, everyone of which was to have proved to the country what practical administrators the Tory statesmen were and what good they could do for England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales now that Mr. Gladstone and his Home Rule policy were out of the way. What now is to come of all these promises? There is no time left to give a chance to any substantial part of the legislation which the government announced that it was its business to carry to success. The one great declaration of the Tory statesmen when they took office was that they were going to do substantial good for the people of Great Britain and Ireland and not to waste any time in absurd and impossible schemes of Home Rule for Ireland. Ireland they were going to satisfy by a great measure of land-tenure reform. England they were going to satisfy by an Education Bill and various other measures of an equally practical nature. Scotland was to have something all to herself, and Wales some peculiar measures of propitiation. Each and every measure was to be of the practical and not the visionary order. Now I think the most disputatious mind will admit that the first business of practical statesmanship is to be practical. It is of little use calling one's self a practical statesman if one brings in measures which cannot be carried into law. But this is exactly the condition of the present Tory government. Whatever anyone may say of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, it must be admitted that he carried it through the House of Commons and that it was rejected only by the House of Lords. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Balfour's Education Bill, it must be admitted that it had to be withdrawn from the House of Commons. There is actually no time left in the present session during which to carry any substantial measures through Parliament. The Tory members are almost all of them gentlemen who are given up to the moors at the regular season, and whom the stoutest cart-ropes could not hold in their places at Westminster after the 12th of August. Most of the government measures will be withdrawn

just as the Educational Bill was withdrawn. Nobody cares about the Irish Land Tenure Bill, except a few Irish landlords, and these do not care about it in its original form, and only stick to it in the hope that it may be so much improved in their sense as to give them some direct advantages. Therefore there is no rashness in the assumption that the session of 1896 is an absolutely wasted session. In truth, the huge majority of the Tories was, in one sense, a disadvantage to them. It made them too confident and cocksure.

Then the government was singularly unfortunate in its foreign policy. Some of the misfortunes were due to the policy itself; others came from events and causes over which the government had no control. The country saw with amazement a new Egyptian campaign started, about which the government could not or would not give any explanation whatever. The events in South Africa, and especially Dr. Jameson's raid, told heavily against the Tory statesmen, although it cannot be denied that Mr. Chamberlain showed great courage and skill in his manner of dealing with a very serious and unexpected crisis. All this, however, was distinctly damaging to the government in public opinion. What the outer public saw was that the Tory government had brought us into nothing but trouble abroad, and was able to do nothing whatever for us at home. On one or two occasions of great moment lately the government majority suddenly shrank to little more than half its ordinary number. One man was lax in his attendance because he did not like what the government had been doing in one way; another man stayed at home because the government had refused to oblige him in some other way; a third man did not see why he should tie himself to the House of Commons for the sake of a set of ministers who were forever wrangling among themselves; a fourth man was sulky because he did not see why "Joe Chamberlain" should be allowed to boss the whole show—and so on. It is very possible that if the government had had but a small majority these troubles would never have assumed so serious a magnitude. Men would have swallowed their private or personal grievances and felt bound to stand by their leaders all the same. But, as the condition of things was, it became quite easy for Jack to say to himself that there was no reason for his sticking to the House, inasmuch as Tom, Dick and Harry were certain to be in close attendance there, and therefore

he went off with a light heart and not the slightest compunction of conscience.

Now of course we all know that where there is a great majority that majority will not under ordinary conditions dwindle all of a sudden. It would take several sessions to bring the Tory majority to vanishing point, unless something very unexpected were to happen. But then in that wide field of foreign policy which the Tory statesmen have lately entered with so light a heart, there is no telling what news any day may bring. Nothing so much discredits a government in England as any real and striking reverses in its foreign policy. The Liberals are always complaining of the present government because of its vast expenditure for the increase of the strength of the navy. A great many devoted Tories on the other hand insist that the government is not doing half enough for the navy. A disaster in Egypt would shatter the strength of any administration which could not feel it had the whole support of the country behind its policy. The present government could not possibly feel that it had any such support, because it never condescended to take the country into its confidence, and, as I have already said, either could not tell or would not tell what the new war movement was all about. A sense of utter insecurity was thus generated which may not have a very practical effect if everything goes right, but may have a very practical effect, indeed, if anything should go wrong. If Mr. Balfour were less of a philosopher and an amateur, I should think he must feel very anxious about the present crisis. But I dare say he will console himself with divine philosophy. To him it possibly seems that, to use the once familiar saying, "there's nothing new, and there's nothing true, and it don't signify." No one can doubt that the government has got into serious trouble even amongst its own followers and adherents by the singular feebleness of its policy in regard to the Armenian massacres. England had much better have let the Armenians alone if she had not made up her mind to take a firm stand on their behalf. The Tory government, by threatening Turkey without having any intention of putting the threats into force, did only harm to the unfortunate Armenians. The Tory threats offended the Sultan and the Turkish ruling populations, and exasperated them more than ever against the deserted Armenians. Religious hatred and racial hatred flamed out with ten times keener

force when England intervened, and above all when it came to be gradually made clear that England's threatened intervention meant nothing at all. We all remember what happened in the sudden intervention of the immortal Don Quixote. Don Quixote saw a man scourging his unfortunate apprentice. Don Quixote intervened and insisted that the apprentice must be scourged no more. Then he mounted his horse again and went his way. The moment his heroic figure disappeared below the horizon the man tied up his apprentice again and scourged him worse than ever. This was exactly what happened with regard to the English intervention for the protection of Armenia. I am not by any means inclined to class Lord Salisbury with any manner of Don Quixote. I am not inclined to admit that the Tory government had really much of the chivalrous and heroic purpose which belonged to Cervantes's deathless hero. But the effect was much the same. As soon as the Porte got to know that nothing serious was to come of England's intervention, the Turkish pashas tied up the Armenian apprentice over again and scourged him more cruelly than ever. Now I have been in Turkey and I know something about the ruling classes there. I am perfectly convinced that a strong, stern word from Lord Salisbury would have settled the whole trouble in Armenia. There is an old story about a brief exchange of despatches between two chieftains in the far-off legendary days of my own country. One chieftain wrote to the other, "Pay me my tribute, or else —." The other chieftain concisely replied, "I owe you no tribute and if —." I wish we could have had some such exchange of correspondence in regard to the Armenian troubles. I wish England had written, "Let the Armenians alone or else —," and that Turkey could have had the nerve to reply, "I'll not let the Armenians alone, and if —." Then we should have found ourselves face to face with the whole difficulty. But I am afraid that even in that case Lord Salisbury would have accepted the ultimatum and caved in. No man in his senses, I think, could believe that Turkey would have dared to resist in arms the power of England. But then, of course, I should be told that there was the question about the attitude of Russia. Russia would support Turkey, Russia would bring France along with her, Russia would do this, that and the other. I do not believe that Russia would have ventured to prevent England from acting on the rights given to her by a special clause in

one of the conventions with Turkey, which authorized England to use her influence for the protection of the Christians in Armenia. I am not an Englishman, but what I complain of in Lord Salisbury and his colleagues is that they seem to have undervalued altogether the strength and the authority of England. I utterly deny that England has fallen so low in her influence and power that she is unable, for very fear, to insist on the carrying out of the conventions which were especially entrusted to her care. It would be very hard indeed to convince me that Russia would have ventured to join with Turkey in a war against England because England insisted upon the recognition of agreements for the protection of Christians in Armenia to which Russia herself was a consenting party. I observe that the United States government has got the better of the Ottoman Porte in many questions regarding the treatment of American subjects in Armenia. Now the United States have got a very small navy, and, roughly speaking, no army at all. But everybody knows that America can have an army and can have a navy whenever she is in need of both, and the Sultan knew very well that when dealing with America he had to deal with a government which would do what it said. The Sultan knew perfectly well also that Lord Salisbury had not the faintest notion of putting his threats into execution, and therefore he snapped his fingers in England's face and felt quite certain that he could accomplish the unseemly performance without the least dread of serious consequence.

Of course it has been asked why England should be plunged into the horrors of war for the sake of the Christians in the Turkish dominions. That is what would be called, in House of Commons phraseology, the "previous question." If England had made up her mind that she would not run any risks for the Christians in Asia Minor her only other duty was to leave them to their fate. Lord Salisbury's government might, of course, have indited some touching little homily to the Sultan and pointed out to him how wicked it was to allow his Christian subjects to be oppressed, and warned him that by such goings-on he would forfeit the respect of all well-regulated nations and then left him to his own reflections. But the truth is that in the first instance Lord Salisbury did bully the Ottoman government and then allowed it to be quite clear that he meant bullying and

nothing more. I heard John Bright once say that he was opposed to all English intervention in foreign affairs because he was sure the intervention would come into actual practice at the wrong time, or on the wrong side, or not at all. I so far agree with him that I think it would be infinitely better if England were to stand absolutely aloof from all intervention in foreign affairs than to do as she did in this wretched Armenian question, and intervene just to a point which only insulted and maddened the dominant race, and took no steps to mitigate the sufferings of the subjected population. "May the vengeance of Heaven," says Sydney Smith, "fall upon the crowned conspirators of Verona; but I hope so far as England is concerned they may be left to the vengeance of Heaven." It would have been far better if the English Tory statesmen had made up their minds to leave the Sultan and his pashas to the vengeance of Heaven, or else had lifted up their hearts and tried to be the instruments of Heaven themselves. I think no one who watches closely the course of English public affairs can doubt that the Tory government must have suffered severely even in Tory public opinion from the utter feebleness of its policy in regard to the Christian subjects of the Porte. I meet with a great many Tory political men of generally independent opinions, and I never met with any such men who did not say that England ought to have intervened to some practical purpose or not to have intervened at all. Among the many influences likely to be more and more injurious to the government of Lord Salisbury, even among his own followers, is this impression, growing day by day, that England has been made to play a poor and pitiful part, and even a very damaging and disastrous part, in her unfortunate attempt to protect the Christian populations of England's personally protected pet, the Ottoman Empire.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

AN INDUSTRIAL OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICA.

BY E. SOWERS.

FEW of the great modern industries have had a more varied and checkered career on the way to final success than the manufacture of sugar from the beet.

In 1747 Marggraf, a modest scholar of Germany, read a paper before the Berlin Academy of Sciences, of which he was a member, in which he announced his discovery of a method of producing sugar from the beet; he explained the processes of manufacture, and exhibited samples for the inspection of the Academy; he also expressed his belief that great practical benefits would follow from it, and that Europe would find in that root the basis of an immense industry. The Academy received the announcement with incredulous surprise, and no doubt regarded the opinion of Marggraf as to the importance of his discovery as the dream of an enthusiast and a visionary. Yet his products appealed to the senses in attestation of the verity of his discovery. We doubt if another instance can be found in which the sequel proved that the discoverer at the outset had so just an insight into the scope and magnitude of his discovery, or a truer view of its value and importance. Marggraf was one of the small class of men who were then earnestly devoting themselves to the investigation of those sciences whose glorious possibilities they dimly saw, and faithfully labored to produce. He was poor and without the aid of commercial or political influence. He had watched with cautious zeal the development of his discovery; he had applied all available tests to detect any error in his methods, or any fallacy in his reasonings; and having done this he confidently submitted his discovery and his methods to the Academy at Berlin. It was all he could do. The common fate of discoverers

was his, for thenceforth his discovery slept in undisturbed repose for half a century.

In 1797 Achard, a pupil of Marggraf and who shared his master's faith and confidence in the value of the discovery, announced to the Berlin Academy the results of his own improvements in the methods of producing sugar from beets. These improvements were of such a nature as to kindle hope and expectation in the minds of the doubtful and indifferent. The discoveries of Achard had early attracted the attention of Baron de Koppy, who devoted one of his estates in Lower Silesia to the culture of beets, erecting a factory for the manufacture of beet sugar in 1805, and placing both estate and factory under the control of Achard. So great was Achard's confidence that he built a factory on his own estate at Cunern, and on his own account embarked as well in the culture of the beet as in the manufacture of sugar. These enterprises were so successful, under the wise and prudent management of Achard in the financial and manufacturing departments of the business, as to be deemed, in a practical way, brilliant successes. The new industry steadily grew in Germany, and the quality of the products was of such merit and excellence as to sustain with credit rigid tests in comparison with the best samples of sugar produced from cane. Indeed, in respect to quality and excellence, and in ability to serve equally as well all uses to which it may be applied, it must be conceded that beet sugar in less than fifteen years after its first manufacture had won its right to a place by the side of the best sugars produced from cane. It should be stated that William I., King of Prussia, notwithstanding the distresses of his kingdom by reason of war, gave substantial aid to the new industry by exempting from taxes land devoted to the culture of the beet and factories used in the making of sugar, and by liberal loans to assist the manufacturers, many of which he afterwards released without payment. In 1799 Achard announced the discovery and his improved methods of manufacture. He presented samples of his products to the Institute of France at Paris, and expressed his belief that by this method sugar could be produced from the beet at a cost of six cents a pound. The Institute received the announcement with great satisfaction, and were deeply impressed with the possibilities of the discovery, and of its importance and value. A committee was at once chosen from those deemed best fitted to make

the investigation, to whom the subject was referred. A close examination was begun which extended as well to the culture of the beet as to the methods of manufacture. In due time the committee reported; and this report was so favorable as speedily to lead to many attempts in France to manufacture sugar from beets. These attempts in the main were so successful as to merit and receive imperial favor and support. In a few years the subject came to be viewed with much interest in France; the products of their manufactories were so large and of such excellent quality as to justify the belief in 1813 that a new industry of the utmost importance and of vast public benefit would be built up in France. Among the rulers and statesmen of Europe the Emperor Napoleon alone clearly saw the magnitude and value of the discovery, and from the outset he favored and encouraged in a substantial manner every interest involved in the subject, and to his favor and support in large measure is due its rapid development and its taking at last a permanent place among the industries of France.

But it should be remembered that the commercial conditions in Europe from 1800 to 1815 were such as to favor and stimulate the production of beet sugar. During that time wars were almost continuous. The commerce of France and of the German States was nearly driven from the seas. Sugar was then produced only in tropical countries, and mostly in the West Indies. The prices per pound for the common varieties during this period in Germany ranged from twelve to thirty-five cents, the best quality of refined sugar sometimes bringing ninety-five cents a pound, and this, too, at a period when the estimated annual consumption per capita was less than two pounds. The conditions of the market and the estimated annual consumption during this time in France were substantially the same as in Germany. It is manifest that these conditions would tend greatly to stimulate the production of beet sugar, and would promise liberal profits on the capital invested. The rapid enlargement of the industry during that period in France and Germany, and the quantity and the excellence of the products, were such as to justify the belief in its complete ultimate success. But the fall of Napoleon, in 1815, and the return of peace again opened the ports and markets of the world. This change in the conditions of trade at once presented a grave problem to the new industry. Can it compete with the products of the cane-growing lands of the tropics? or will that competition

crush and destroy it ? In due time we shall see the answer which time and events shall give.

Let us briefly note the reception given to the new industry by the people of the leading nations of Europe. In Germany the authority imputed to the Academy at Berlin, the favorable regard of the King and government, and the almost instant success of the new industry by reason of the excellence of its products, there gained for it a respectful hearing on its merits. The gay and volatile wits of France noted the fact that the discovery was of German origin, and for many years in spite of surprising results the new industry was the butt of wit and sarcasm, which abated only after the clearest proofs of the success of the new enterprise. The commercial supremacy of England gave to the opinion prevailing among its commercial classes a weight and authority in Europe which belonged to no other nation. The opinion of these classes in England respecting the production of beet sugar was plain and outspoken ; while few, if any, seem to have made any effort to study the subject, yet ignorance was not deemed to disqualify one from holding and expressing an unqualified opinion as to the folly of the claim that any benefit could come from the new discovery ; indeed, the subject was deemed too contemptible to merit an investigation. It was assailed with a storm of abuse and ridicule such as seldom before had been known. The press swarmed with articles aiming to bring the new industry into contempt and derision ; the stage in play and farce sought to impress its patrons with a conception of the folly of attempting to extract sugar from a root fit only to be food for beasts ; the clubs deemed it a proper target for wit and a fit subject for ridicule ; the newspapers and periodicals taxed the skill of illustrators for grotesque embellishments in aid of every attempt at ridicule to the end that an industry might perish which at bottom was feared as a menace to a great commercial interest of England. Webster in his speech on the tariff in 1824 expressed the views then held by the commercial classes in this country in the following terms :

"Nor have we been referred to the attempts under the same system to make sugar from common culinary vegetables, attempts which serve to fill the print shops of Europe, and to show us how easy is the transition from what some think sublime to that which all admit to be ridiculous. The folly of some of these

projects has not been surpassed, nor hardly equalled, unless it be by the philosopher in one of the satires of Swift, who so long labored to extract sunbeams from cucumbers."

It is obvious that Webster's knowledge of the subject was obtained from purely English sources; and that the knowledge so derived was so crude and defective as even then to be worthless.

But the storm of wit and ridicule in due time spent its fury, and a calm succeeded. It soon became manifest that those who had best studied the subject, and who best knew the facts respecting it in France and Germany, had unshaken confidence in the new industry. The decade following 1815 brought to the new enterprise its severest trials. During that time the factories in France and Germany were mostly closed, and the fields once devoted to the culture of the beet were applied to other uses. But in a few years the industry and energy of the people had so far restored the trade of Europe as that commercial demands for certain products had increased beyond all former precedents. The demand for sugar had increased one, two and threefold, till the crude and wasteful methods of production then existing in the tropical sugar producing countries were taxed to their utmost and yet failed to supply the demand. In this increased demand will be found a potent factor in solving the problem of the longer continuance of the beet-sugar industry in Europe. In fact the volume of increase had become so large as to surpass the recent exaggerations of wit and ridicule. Under these conditions plans were soon formed to revive the industry in Europe. The culture of the beet was renewed and enlarged and the factories again were opened. In 1835 the industry in France and Germany had fairly started under the new conditions; and that of France was so fortunate as to come for a time under the influence of the sagacious and prudent Delisse, to whose wisdom and courage the ultimate success of the beet-sugar industry in France is greatly indebted.

We submit the following table showing the production of beet sugar in France at intervals of ten years:

In 1829-30 (August 1 to July 31)	4,380 tons
" 1839-40	22,784 "
" 1849-50	62,165 "
" 1859-60	126,479 "
" 1869-70	282,136 "

In 1873 the production had increased to 409,916 tons, while in 1889-90 the production was 750,000 tons.

The annual consumption per capita in France in 1830 was two pounds. For the decade beginning with 1840 the consumption in France increased nearly fourfold. In 1865 the annual per capita consumption was fourteen pounds; while in 1890 it had become twenty-six pounds.

As this industry originated in Germany, so also shall we find there its greatest development. The same causes which depressed and almost ruined it in France from 1815 to 1829 also operated with like disastrous results during that time in Germany. But the same causes which tended to revive the industry in France also produced a like effect in Germany, and in a few years the culture of the beet was largely increased and the number of factories were rapidly multiplied.

The following table will show the production in Germany for the years named, and will serve also to show the uniform and steady increase of the production:

	Sugar, tons.	Molasses, tons.
For 1840	13,445	8,955
" 1850	52,586	19,877
" 1860	126,526	35,224
" 1865	180,000	50,544
" 1871-72	186,442	63,892
" 1881-82	599,722	150,813
" 1889-90	1,213,689	240,797

Such an increase in production for half a century, during which every influence that tends to stimulate or depress it was at times present and in active operation, can leave no doubt of the sure and firm foundation on which the industry at last rests in the commercial world.

The following statement will show the exports of sugar products for the years named:

In 1876-77	57,953 tons
" 1886-87	643,340 "
" 1889-90	718,985 "

These statements tend to show the growth and magnitude of this industry in Germany. It is there no longer an experiment; it has gained a place among the great industries of the nation, nay, of the world; and it promises well to maintain the position which after a long and severe contest and with many reverses it has at last won. In 1890 the people of the United States paid to the manufacturers of Germany $16,000,000 for about 200,000 tons of beet sugar imported into the United States, nearly three

times more than they paid that year for any other article imported from Germany.

That portion of the United States in and near the latitude of the lakes and extending from ocean to ocean seems to unite in happy proportions all the elements that tend to the production of the sugar beet as good in quality as are anywhere grown. Parts of Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and California and Utah, have already been devoted to the culture of the sugar beet, with such results as respects quantity and excellence as to give good reason for expecting a brilliant future for the new industry.

The rich soils of California and Utah, their warm and even climate, leave no want in these respects unsupplied; and when irrigation is added the yield is surprising as well for its abundance as its excellence. The production of beet sugar in the United States was:

In 1891	12,004,838 lbs.
" 1892	27,003,322 "
" 1893	44,836,527 "

Of this quantity Nebraska produced in 1891 2,734,500 lbs.; in 1892, 3,808,511 lbs., and in 1893, 5,835,900 lbs. In 1892 California produced about 20,000,000 lbs., and other parts of the United States about 3,000,000 lbs. Nebraska and the Dakotas seem to be specially adapted to the culture of the sugar-beet, and in Nebraska also is found one of the most successful manufactories of beet sugar. There, to a natural richness of soil is added, in the season of rapid growth, a sufficient rainfall to supply the needed moisture, while the temperature for the months of June, July, August, and September is so high and even as to bring the beet to full maturity early in October. The farmers of Nebraska seemed to have learned their advantages in this industry, and the quantity of land now annually devoted to the culture of the beet is steadily increasing, and meantime a better understanding of the methods of cultivating the beet has led to results beneficial as well to the farmer as to the manufacturer. Indeed, in Nebraska and the Dakotas, the opinion now seems to be quite prevalent that the sugar beet will equal in profit to the farmer any crop there grown. The experience of the growers of the beet and of the manufacturers of beet sugar, hitherto, in this country, has been much the same as of the like classes in France and Germany. Indeed, it now seems probable that the late improvements in the methods of manufacturing beet sugar, and a better

knowledge of the conditions which tend to increase the yield of beets and to improve their quality, have solved for us the problem of the profitable cultivation of the beet for the farmer, and of the making of beet sugar for the manufacturer.

The conditions in the United States for the development of this industry for the past few years have not been favorable. The repeal of the bounty clause in the late tariff act, and the withholding of bounties payable under it till the late decision of the Supreme Court, with the importation of foreign sugars free of duty, have brought the beet growers and the manufacturers of beet sugar into free competition with the sugar producers of the world. It is quite probable that the late increase of the national debt will lead to the imposition of duties on imported foreign sugars, and that in this way some measure of protection will be given to domestic sugar producers. We have no *data* at hand of the production of beet sugar in the United States for 1894 and 1895. The UnitedStates spends annually about $135,000,000 for sugar, of which more than eight-tenths goes to foreign countries. We consume one-fourth of the exported sugar product of the world. The magnitude and the value of the trade is clearly shown by this vast annual expenditure.

A summary of a few important facts respecting this industry may be of general interest. The yield of sugar-beets varies from twelve to forty tons per acre. The best land with good cultivation and a favorable season will yield from twenty to thirty-five tons per acre, but the crop would be hardly profitable at a yield of less than twelve tons per acre. In California the greatest production from a single acre of land was a little more than forty tons of beets; but this is an unusual yield. The estimated cost of production per acre is about fifty dollars. In the present condition of the methods of manufacture, from eight to twelve pounds of beets are required in the making of one pound of sugar; the quantity varies according to the greater or lesser richness of the beets in sugar. The price changes with the conditions of the market. About four years ago beet sugar from Germany was landed on the wharves of New York at a cost of three dollars and eighty-one cents a hundred pounds. It rarely now costs above five cents a pound. Very great improvements in the processes of manufacture have been made since 1835. Then from four to five per cent. of the beet could be converted into sugar, as against

twelve to sixteen now; then the cost of production per pound was eight to twelve cents, against two to four now. In 1893 the average cost per pound of manufacture in the United States was three cents; and twenty-four thousand acres of land was that year applied to the growth of sugar-beets, which brought to the farmer an average price of four dollars and fifty cents a ton. In 1893 there were seven beet-sugar manufactories in the United States with a capital of about two million dollars. The statistics respecting this subject in the United States for 1893 (and this was one of the poorest seasons for production) show that the sugar product from the beets grown on an acre of land was from 3,661 to 4,620 pounds. As respects quality and fitness for any use to which sugar is now applied, it is not questioned that beet sugar is in all points the equal of cane sugar.

The annual consumption of sugar per capita in England is sixty pounds; in France and Switzerland it is twenty-six pounds; in Germany it is eighteen pounds; while in the United States it it is forty-four pounds. France, Germany, and Austria now produce beet sugar enough for home consumption; and but little sugar is now imported into either of these countries, while Germany and France annually export large quantities. Fifty years ago ninety-four per cent. of the annual sugar product of Cuba found a market in Europe; now that proportion of its production is sold in the United States.

We submit that these facts respecting the growth and development of this industry in Germany show that the prevision of Marggraf in regard to the value and practical importance of his discovery, and that it would become the basis of a great industry, was accurate in every particular. So also was the confidence of Achard, manifested when he announced the discovery to the Institute of France, as to its importance, and as to the price at which by this process sugar could at last be produced, fully justified by the course of events. For a series of years in France and Germany this industry was favored by duties on foreign sugars, by bounties, by exemption from taxes, and by taxes on imported sugars; till the vast increase of consumption, cheap labor, the joint skill of producers and manufacturers, have given it at last such strength as to enable it to compete successfully with the sugars produced from cane. In 1892 the manufacturers of Germany sold to English purchasers nearly six hundred thousand

tons of beet sugar, all of which was the product of their own fields and manufactories. If France, Germany, and Austria can obtain from beets grown on their own lands and made by their own manufacturers their supply of sugar for domestic uses, and have left besides three-fourths of a million tons for annual exportation to foreign countries, why should not the farmers and manufacturers of the United States grow the beets and make the sugar needed for domestic uses, and so save for all the wages and profits incident to such an industry ? It cannot be doubted that the natural conditions in the United States are as favorable for this object as they were in France, Germany, and Austria ; and hence no reason in the nature of things exists why this industry should not flourish among us, nor why our farmers, manufacturers, and capitalists should not save this large annual foreign expenditure, and assist to further diversify our industries, and increase the skill of our artisans, by a new addition thereto of immense value and of great practical usefulness.

E. SOWERS.

THE COMING STRUGGLE ON THE NILE.

BY ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

EGYPT is entering on a critical phase of her development as a modern nationality. It is not too rash to predict that the events of the next year or so will definitely determine her position as a factor affecting the European political system. For over a decade that position has been equivocal, owing to the correct attitude of Great Britain, who desires to redeem her promise of evacuation, but sees no present prospect of the concomitant conditions being fulfilled. The persistent opposition of France to the British occupation, partaking largely of vexatious obstruction, undoubtedly retards the emancipation of Egypt from foreign control; and, in view of the compromising situation on the Soudan frontier, its strength will now be put to a definite test.

The newly inaugurated Nile campaign is the ostensible cause of the derangement of the *status quo;* but, as I shall endeavor to explain, it is not the fundamental cause; other circumstances than the transparent pretext of renewed Dervish hostility are responsible for the altered situation. It is clear that Egypt has taken the first step in a policy which is vital to her, which is certain to tax her utmost resources, and may ultimately involve her in serious financial embarrassments. She is committed to the reconquest of her former territories, under the practical guarantee of Great Britain that any strategic posts recovered from the Mahdists shall be permanently held. The greater her military success, the larger will be the demands made upon her resources. Her scientific frontier at Wadi Halfa—and, in the opinion of military experts, it *was* a scientific frontier, easily defended—having been abolished, she has boldly advanced into the Soudan at a season of the year when military operations are necessarily conducted under the least favorable conditions, and with the

avowed intention of penetrating as far south as the opposition offered by the Khalifa shall determine, or, to quote another official version, until her surplus funds are exhausted. The present objective is Dongola; but that, admittedly, is only the first step towards Khartoum.

Great Britain, and not Egypt, is morally responsible for this forward movement, although the military operations are nominally conducted under the Egyptian flag. The *bona fides* of the protectoral power is scarcely questioned, except perhaps by France and Russia, and it is honorably established by the fact that, until the Soudanese provinces are recovered, the task of Great Britain in Egypt will remain incomplete.

Her Majesty's government were directly responsible for the evacuation of the Soudan, which had fallen into a state of anarchy in consequence of Egyptian misrule. The popular rising known as the Mahdist revolt eventually drove Egypt from the Upper Nile and established a bandit hierarchy in her place. The sanctuary of the Mahdists, which formerly was a source of illicit profit to individual slave-traders and Egyptian Pashas, though always a drain on the Cairo exchequer (except for a brief period under Gordon's administration, when the Soudan cost Egypt nothing), has since represented a constant menace to Egypt, involving a considerable expenditure for military protection. But this outlay was reduced to a minimum by withdrawing behind the scientific frontier at Wadi Halfa and retaining Suakin. The desert regions thus opposed obstacles very difficult even for the Dervishes to overcome in delivering an attack in force upon bases well under the control of Egypt.

Egypt, being under the tutelage of Great Britain, the Dervish menace is partly directed against the protectoral state. This accounts for the military coöperation of Great Britain. Lower Egypt was originally occupied by British troops after the Arabi revolt, with the ostensible object of "restoring the authority of the Khedive." The army of occupation is merely the outward and visible sign of her intention to maintain by force, if necessary, the integrity and neutrality of Egypt; its withdrawal is contingent on the capacity and *bona fides* of the Egyptian government to maintain the *status quo*. Apart from forcible ejection, therefore, the contingencies inimical to the maintenance of British control over Egypt are—the renewal of hostili-

ties on the part of the Dervishes, the total collapse of the Mahdist movement and organization, the withdrawal of Italy from Eritrea, the military ascendancy of Abyssinia, or hostile enterprises on the part of European rivals.

In spite of the undoubted fact that the bloody tyranny of the Khalifa has alienated his followers and is becoming less and less potent for evil, so far as the security of the Egyptian frontier is concerned, the Dervish leader still claims the adherence of tribes which are unable of themselves, however willing, to resist his commands. But the evidence in our possession proves incontestably that even Egyptian rule would now be preferred by large numbers of so-called Dervishes (the Baggara Arabs chiefly excepted), if only they be assured, by the military success of Egypt guaranteeing the eventual re-occupation of the Soudan, that a change of mastership would protect them against their present oppressor. The renewed hostilities on the part of the Dervishes may, therefore, be regarded as a despairing bid for the support of all those subversive forces in the Soudan upon which their rule is based. They may have received some encouragement from the recent serious reverses inflicted by the Abyssinians upon the Italian expeditionary forces, and a certain amount of confidence from the general spirit of native turbulence and revolt at present prevailing throughout the greater part of Africa; but their adherence to a moribund cause, the fraud of which has been fully exposed, would receive its deathblow should Egypt succeed in recovering Dongola, Abu Hamed, and Berber, and in inflicting serious losses in the field. Khartoum would then lie open to a victorious Egyptian army.

The occupation of Uganda by Great Britain, the intrusion of military expeditions equipped by Great Britain, the Congo Independent State, and France, having the acquisition of the Upper Nile territories as their objective, and in particular the intrigues of France and Russia in Abyssinia, have profoundly affected the general situation. The net result is that political domination over the Upper Nile has become a question that can no longer be kept open by the unreclaimed (and, as some assert, the lapsed) rights of Egypt. Her Majesty's government have, therefore, decided, in the interests of Egypt, of which they are the trustees, to to take the first step towards the reconquest and pacification of the Soudan. Henceforth, any foreign power prejudicing those in-

terests by action that may be regarded as hostile, will be guilty of an unfriendly act.

The origin of the Nile expedition may thus be ascribed to a combination of the circumstances to which reference has been made; but its leading motive is, I contend, to anticipate the action of France and Russia on the Upper Nile and to check their combined opposition in Egypt proper. For it is not to be denied that, apart from that motive, the present moment is inopportune—or, at least, premature—for the initiation of a policy of such far-reaching consequences as the recovery of the Soudan for Egypt. The mere fact of a recrudescence of Dervish hostility or of the danger threatening Kassala cannot be urged as in itself necessitating an advance into the Soudan; for these have always been more or less permanent factors of the situation. Nor has the Dervish movement yet reached that stage when an advance to Dongola might be regarded as a mere *but de promenade militaire*. The Egyptian army, in spite of its remarkable efficiency, must depend largely upon British support for any extended operations in the Soudan; and, though at present the objective is strictly limited, it will inevitably be found necessary to secure other strategic positions before even Dongola may be held with safety. Sooner or later, British troops must go to the front; and, in the present state of international politics, that is a prospect which cannot be regarded with equanimity. For that reason, if for no other, Her Majesty's government would be open to censure for embarking upon a policy the issue of which cannot be foreseen, except under the assumption that our obligations to Egypt necessitated the acceptance of this risk.

The theory that *force majeure*, or ulterior considerations, and not merely the reasons assigned in Parliament for the advance to Dongola, precipitated the action of the British Cabinet, receives support from the actual course of events.

In his report for 1895, Lord Cromer refers to "the political tranquility which has prevailed in Egypt during the past year, and which stands in somewhat marked contrast to the general uneasiness of immediately antecedent periods." As regards military administration, he reports: "With the exception of a small raid on a village in the Wadi Halfa District, and an insignificant incursion into the Tokar Delta, the Dervish forces in

the immediate vicinity of the Egyptian advanced posts, although of considerable strength, have maintained a strictly defensive attitude." And he adds: "I fear that raids similar in character to those which took place last year (1895) must, from time to time, be expected." The situation was, therefore, normal at the end of 1895.

In the early part of 1896, three telegrams were despatched by Lord Cromer to Her Majesty's government. These telegrams, dated February 24, 26, and 28, announced the advance of Osman Digna into the Suakin District, having Kassala as the immediate objective, and reported threatened attacks by the Devishes upon Murat Wells (then garrisoned by an Egyptian force) and Kokreb, as well as the departure from Omdurman of reinforcements for Dongola. The British Consul at Suakin wrote in confirmation of these facts and stated that the Khalifa had proclaimed the *Jehad*, or holy war, against the Italians. It is thus clear that the Dervishes were preparing for an attack on Kassala and the Suakin District; but it is by no means evident that they contemplated any extraordinary raids upon Egypt proper.

On March 1, occurred the battle of Adua, by which the Italians suffered a serious reverse at the hands of the Abyssinians. On March 3, the Italian Minister of War ordered the abandonment of Adigrat and Kassala. On March 11, Her Majesty's government telegraphed to Lord Cromer ordering the advance of Egyptian troops to Dongola, in order to make a demonstration or diversion in favor of Italy, with the object of relieving the pressure upon Kassala.

The danger threatening Kassala caused great concern to Her Majesty's military advisers both at home and in Eyypt. The British Ambassador at Rome protested against the evacuation of Kassala, because, he argued, its fall would encourage the Dervishes and set free their forces for an attack upon the Egyptian positions. The Italian Minister of War therefore wired to General Baldissera: "If military conditions do not render the evacuation of Kassala necessary, the government desires that Kassala should continue to be occupied for political reasons!" General Baldissera, however, telegraphed (April 19): "What am I to do respecting Kassala? At present I have recalled Stevani with the greater portion of his forces." (Colonel Stevani was in command at Kassala). The Italian Minister of War at once replied (April

20): "Manage to maintain the occupation of Kassala until autumn; then we will see what is to be done, but if any grave military danger requires evacuation, the discretion to do so [carry it out] is left to you."

That is practically all the evidence, apart from ministerial statements, upon which we may base an opinion. It was in order to save Kassala, and incidentally to assist Italy, that the Dongola expedition was ordered. The menace to Egypt consisted in the investment of Kassala by the Dervishes, who were, it may here be mentioned, subsequently driven off. Had Kassala fallen, the Suakin District would have been threatened—as, for many years after its original evacuation by Egypt, it was threatened—by the Dervish occupation of a strong base. But, one may pertinently ask, if that alone were the menace, why did not Egypt offer to garrison Kassala itself (the route thence from the Red Sea littoral being open and safe) in accordance with the agreement between the Anglo-Egyptian authorities and Italy? That would have been the most simple and natural arrangement, and one that, according to present provisions, will undoubtedly be carried out in the autumn. It is true that the Dervishes were also threatening Murat Wells (between Korosko and Abu Hamed) and Kokreb (between Suakin and Berber), and that re-inforcements had been despatched to Dongola; but there was nothing in this situation—more or less a normal one—to warrant an advance in force beyond the scientific frontier, which has been easily held against far more serious menaces in the past. It is not until we come to examine ministerial statements that we discover the true objective of the expedition.

The Marquis of Salisbury, speaking in the House of Lords on June 12, was perfectly frank and explicit in his explanations to Lord Rosebery. Whilst admitting that the action of Her Majesty's government was largely due to friendship for Italy, and the necessity of saving Kassala, and that for many reasons an advance into the Soudan was inopportune at the present moment, he contended that "the interests of Egypt, in the first instance, and the interests of Italy, and *all that depends on the interests of Italy,* were affected by the result." He concluded by stating "that we shall not have restored Egypt to the position in which we received her, that we shall not have placed Egypt in that position of safety in which she deserves to stand, until the

Egyptian flag floats over Khartoum." But at the same time, he confessed: "In the present financial position, I am compelled to say that our object terminates at Dongola."

In the House of Commons, on March 21, Mr. Chamberlain contested the view that the situation was in any way altered. "The situation," he said, "was not altered. We shall be as ready afterwards—*at least, as we were before*—to consider any proposals leading to the eventual evacuation of Egypt; and we have never gone back from our pledges in that respect." I was in the House when this statement was made, and noted the saving clause, which was jerked in as an after-thought, in Mr. Chamberlain's inimitable style, and was received with derisive laughter. He went on to say that, as regarded evacuation, we had been too sanguine in the past. "That," he added, "was a mistake we were not likely to repeat." He complained that the action of France and Russia ("some of our allies") had retarded our work in Egypt; but congratulated Parliament on the support of the Triple Alliance. "As to France and Russia," he explained, "we wait"—a statement which was received with ironical cheers and counter cheers. Having emphasized the undoubted fact "that the control of the Nile was essential to the existence and security of Egypt," he concluded by saying: "The making of the railway (following the advance of the troops to Dongola) may, I think, be assumed to be a pledge that where we go we shall remain. We have no idea of handing back to barbarism such territory—be it more or less—as we may recover for civilization."

Mr. Balfour, on the same occasion, whilst traversing very much the same ground, also stated: "We mean to advance, and where we advance we mean to stay; and everything which is gained for Egypt by this expedition will, we believe, be gained forever."

Thus it is perfectly clear that the expedition to Dongola is the first step towards the reconquest and ultimate pacification of the Soudan. No less clear is it that the critical situation on the Red Sea littoral, following on the Italian reverse at Adua, precipitated an advance which, though always contemplated, Lord Salisbury regards as inexpedient, owing to existing financial, political and other reasons." It is, therefore, to the general political situation, and not to any imminent danger threatening

the Egyptian frontier, that we must look for an explanation of the policy of Her Majesty's government. That situation may be outlined as follows.

The collapse of the Italian military operations in Abyssinia threatened the ascendancy in that part of Africa of a powerful native state, under the moral protection of France and Russia, and encouraged a recrudescence of Dervish hostilities, by which the safety of Kassala was temporarily imperilled. For the last five years Russia and France have been intriguing in Abyssinia, with the object of establishing their influence over that country, and, during the recent hostilities, French agents were known to have supplied the Abyssinians with arms and ammunition that were used against Italy. France, moreover, opposed the demand of Italy to make use of the British base at Zeila for the purpose of executing a flank movement against the Shoan enemy, on the ground that such military action would have infringed the Anglo-French Convention regarding the neutrality of Harar. Had such a demonstration been carried out, with the consent of Great Britain (who was willing to grant Italy's request) and of France, the disaster at Adua might never have occurred. There is, in fact, sufficient evidence to prove that Italy owes her defeat in Abyssinia as much to the Franco-Russian collusion with her enemy as to the impotency of her efforts to impose a political ascendancy, which was indignantly repudiated by a virile and warlike population.

The danger threatening Kassala, having been averted by the defeat of the Dervish force investing this easily defended post, has now passed away. The Duke of Sermoneta instructed the Italian Ambassador in London (General Ferrero) to express his own and the Marquis of Rudini's warm thanks to Lord Salisbury for ordering the Anglo-Egyptian advance to Dongola, "*although,*" he added, "*of little military value to Italy*"; and Italy has consented to hold Kassala until the autumn "for political reasons." But the political conditions in the Eastern Soudan remain as they were. Italy has withdrawn behind the line of the Mareb, and has practically renounced her claims over Abyssinia, her chief stipulation in the terms of peace now being negotiated with Menelik being that no other European power shall be permitted to take her place. The result is that, if France and Russia were allowed a free hand, Egyptian interests on the Upper Nile would

be seriously threatened. This accounts for the open declaration of British ministers that the time has arrived, though in other respects it is premature, for Egypt to take the first step toward the recovery of the Soudan. It only partly justifies this extreme and hazardous measure. The other determining causes, to which brief reference has been made, are the activity of France in extending her sphere of influence on the Congo in the direction of the Upper Nile, and the cordial coöperation of Russia and France in questions concerning the Near East and the Far East. It is feared, and rightly, that, in return for French support, by which Russia has gained so largely in the Far East, the *entente cordiale* or alliance will be utilized for the purpose of undermining British control over Egypt. Signs are not wanting that active steps in that direction are pending. France has yet to receive her *quid pro quo*.

Thus, Great Britain has been forced to take action which, in the interests of Egypt, and especially of herself, might with advantage have been postponed until a more favorable opportunity had presented itself. There can now be no turning back, under the pledge of Her Majesty's government; and the consequence is that Egypt has been committed to the reconquest of the Soudan before she herself is in a position to undertake such a heavy task single-handed. No matter how slow the advance may be—and, owing to conditions well known to exist in the Soudan, it is impossible to regulate an advance that is to be *permanent* by the mere consideration of financial and military expediency—it must necessarily involve the support of British arms. Even in the initial stage it has been found necessary to garrison Suakin with British Indian troops, the cost of which, being partly imposed on India, plainly proves, by the confession of Her Majesty's government that this expedition has imperial objects incident on the maintenance of British control over Egypt. That it has been primarily undertaken in the interest of Egypt herself requires no direct proof, because, under existing conditions, the interests of Egypt and of Great Britain are identical in the Soudan. The ascendancy of any foreign power, other than Great Britain, within the basin of the Nile, would be a serious menace to the independence and integrity of Egypt, and, consequently, to British imperial interests.

The power of the Khalifa, even in the earlier days of his despotic rule, never seriously threatened Egypt proper, and was

easily held in check ; its expiring recrudescence at the present time cannot, therefore, be regarded as a menace to the frontier entailing an advance to Dongola. Besides, no secret is made of the intention of Egypt to advance as far as possible into the Soudan, even to Khartoum, with the object of recovering her lost provinces, finally and definitely. And in order to accomplish that object, in spite of the least conceivable resistance on the part of the Dervishes, the support of British troops and the aid of English money will be found necessary.

It is, in fact, quite obvious that the term of the British occupation must now be indefinitely extended. If the Khedivial government cannot rule Lower Egypt without the aid of a foreign power, it is certain she cannot hope to administer the Soudanese provinces. It is quite unnecessary to recall incidents and facts relating to Egypt's former administration in order to prove how utterly impotent she would be, under existing circumstances, to establish her rule on the Upper Nile. Financial considerations alone should deter her from this herculean task ; because legitimate trade never at any time existed in the Soudan, and to introduce law and order under conditions of anarchy will be the work of years. Only Great Britain, with her Indian experience, trained administrators, and inexhaustible resources, can hope to do this. And if she should undertake it and succeed, what is to be her reward ? When can she hope to retire from the Nile basin, with a protectorate of her own, Uganda, upon which she is prepared to spend large sums of money, absolutely depending upon the resources and closely affected by the political conditions of the Upper Nile ? Is it not perfectly obvious that Great Britain will never—cannot, even if she would—retire now from the position which she has wilfully created for herself by the occupation of Uganda, Unyoro, etc., and by her action in Egypt, except under circumstances for which the past offers no prospect and has given no pledge ? Her promise of ultimate evacuation is as sincere as such promises usually are, and may be repeated in good faith, but she cannot alter the conditions which render that evacuation impossible now and incredible to believe. No sane student of history and politics can imagine an Egypt capable of governing herself and of administering the Soudan, under pressure of international rivalries, and able to defend her integrity against foreign aggression.

For these reasons, France and Russia hope to gain by their action what they can scarcely hope to achieve by their diplomacy —a position of influence in the Nile basin by which the ambitious projects of Great Britain may be hampered. Time and advantage would have been in their favor; and these Her Majesty's government are not prepared to grant them. No other consideration, I contend, can be made to account for the initiation of the Nile campaign. Neither political expediency, apart from the motive assigned, nor ordinary military precautions for the protection of Egypt supply any adequate protest for a policy of such far-reaching consequences. France and Russia recognize this state of affairs; and thus it is that a new period of strife and struggle is dawning for Egypt, the issue of which will definitely determine the nature and extent of European domination over that country and the regions beyond.

ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

THE PAY OF COLLEGE WOMEN.

BY FRANCES M. ABBOTT.

THE woman problem and the industrial problem are subjects of paramount interest to this generation. When the two are interwoven the interest of the combined problem is equalled only by the ignorance concerning it. The Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, numbering nearly 2,000 women who have received college degrees, has just issued a valuable compendium of statistics on the "Compensation in Certain Occupations of Women Who have received College or Other Special Training." Like all the publications of the A. C. A., this pamphlet is distinguished by admirable thoroughness of compilation and fairness of statement. It is my purpose to put the facts into such form that they may be readily assimilated by the general mind.

Before beginning, I wish to warn my readers not to repose too much confidence in these statistics, carefully prepared though they be. Anyone who has ever conducted a written examination in school knows something of the variety of answers that a question can evoke from the human mind. When the minds are mature and highly trained, and the answer depends upon original thought and not upon a previously learned lesson, it seems as if the permutations were infinite. One might almost say that no inquiry ever strikes two people exactly alike. Again, as every collator knows to his sorrow, no matter how intelligent and responsible are the persons to whom a list of inquiries is sent, half of the forms will not be returned, and of the other half a goodly number will have the blanks imperfectly filled out. The marking system as commonly practised in school and college seems to me not less fatuous than the minute fractions of *per cent.* that are elaborately worked out of necessarily imperfect *data.*

Having placed all statistical information in the limbo of uncertainty where it properly belongs, I wish expressly to say that the statements in this paper will have no value five years, possibly two years, hence, for woman's opportunities, and, moreover, industrial conditions in general are changing as rapidly as scientific inventions are being patented.

The object of the A. C. A. in its recent investigation was to find out why, and to what extent an inequality of wages is paid to men and women performing the same kind of work. Circulars were sent out to members of the A. C. A. engaged chiefly in professional, mercantile, or technical pursuits; but the pamphlet says that the inquiries were not in all cases restricted to alumnæ, but include in some instances women, not college-bred, engaged in occupations requiring special training. We are led to infer that the proportion of non-college women is small; but it is to be regretted that the exact figures have not been given, as it leads to confusion, both about the kind of work done by graduates and the compensation they receive.

The number of schedules returned in response to this investigation was 451. They represent all parts of the country—90 from New York, 61 from California, 59 from Massachusetts, 55 from Minnesota, 44 from Connecticut, 40 from Rhode Island, 39 from Indiana, 14 from Illinois, and the remainder (153) scattered among other States. The total number of occupations given is 66, but many of these are very nearly allied. There are 169 teachers, the largest number in any single employment, 47 librarians and women engaged in library work, 28 stenographers, 22 nurses and superintendents of nursing, 19 journalists, including editors and reporters, and 19 clerks without specification as to the kind of service. To show the variety of occupations represented, it may be mentioned that there is an actress, advertising agent, assistant in the National Herbarium, assistant on dictionary, assistant in observatory, astronomer, car recorder, draughtswoman, insurance broker, insurance solicitor, writer of advertisements, reviser of patents, water analyst, beside several proof-readers, telegraph operators, bookkeepers, and artists.

In looking over this list one is at once struck by the absence of physicians. This is probably due to the fact that this investigation does not consider independent workers, but only those employed by some firm or institution. The earnings of independ-

ent workers depend so much upon individual qualities that it is little use to try to classify them.

It may be mentioned in passing, however, that the profession of medicine is probably the most lucrative, as it is certainly one of the most useful and honorable in which women can engage. It has always been a matter of surprise to me that more college women have not undertaken it. Out of a total of 1,945 members in the last register of the A. C. A., but 35, or less than two per cent. write M. D. after their names. So far as I can learn, the woman physician in general practice in the smaller cities receives precisely the same fee as a man. In fact, the fee for an ordinary office or house visit is usually fixed by custom, and the young physician receives the same pay as the older one. The charges of specialists are graded by their reputation; and n the large cities all doctors' fees depend upon the quarter of the town they live in. The income of an established physician (male or female) in any of our cities of 15,000 or more inhabitants cannot be less than several thousand dollars yearly, and though the living expenses (house and horses) must be considerable, the physician can probably make a better financial showing than almost any other woman worker. The profession requires a long and expensive preparatory training, but one would suppose there are plenty of college women who would not be daunted by that.

To return to our tables, we find that 338 of the total number of respondents have some other remunerative occupation besides their main work; 74 have no other, while 39 make no answer. This seems rather surprising, especially as we immediately learn that in 350 cases (about 78 per cent. of the whole) the wages derived from the main occupation are sufficient for the support of the worker. It is further interesting to know that 117, or nearly 26 per cent., report that they are occupied with domestic cares besides their main work. The compilers note that this diversification of industrial pursuits seems to indicate that the burden of the woman is probably heavier than that of her male fellow-worker.

The table most interesting to the general reader is that relating to salaries. There is some surprise that these are given by the monthly instead of the yearly rate. The latter estimate is more intelligible, and also more accurate, because some occupations, mainly teaching, engage one's time for only nine months

of the year. In the absence of any information to the contrary, we may suppose that the teacher's yearly income is divided into twelve parts, in order to classify it with the salary of workers whose occupation continues all the year round.

By consulting the tables we find that 144 respondents, the largest number in any one class, are paid a salary between $50 and $75 a month, *i. e.*, from $600 to $900 a year. On either side of them we find two equal groups of 88 each. One of these groups receives between $25 and $50 a month ($300 to $600 a year) and the other receives between $75 and $100 a month ($900 to $1,200 a year). There are 73 who receive between $100 and $200 a month ($1,200 to $2,500 a year); two who are paid between $200 and $300 a month ($2,400 to $3,600 a year); and then comes the glorious news that two women receive over $300 a month ($3,600 a year).

This last fact ought to give a momentary gleam of happiness to every woman who reads these lines. There are two college women in this country whose services are adjudged by the firm or corporation which employs them as worth over $3,600 a year. One of these women is classed as a teacher (she may be a college president), and one as an insurance solicitor. Under cover of their brilliant record we can slip in the fact that six women acknowledge that they receive less than $25 a month ($300 a year). This is such a manifestly inadequate sum that we are forced to conclude that the whole time of the workers is not paid for, either because they are learning the business or because the business does not require many hours a day. These six workers are classified as follows: Three in library employment, one typesetter, one stenographer, and one assistant postmaster.

To recapitulate: There are 238 who receive less than $75 a month, and 165 who receive from $75 to $300 and over. Perhaps the profession of teaching deserves to be especially considered. Of the 161 teachers who reply to this question, 24 receive under $50 a month; 64 receive between $50 and $75; 42 receive between $75 and $100; 29 between $100 and $200; one between $200 and $300, and one over $300. There is but one other woman who receives between $200 and $300 a month, and she is an editor.

A salary of between $100 and $200 a month ought to support a single woman in comfort. Besides the 29 teachers there are 44

other women who receive this amount. Nine are engaged in library work, four as editors or reporters, four as nurses or superintendents of nursing, four as clerks, three as stenographers, four as typesetters (is not this unexpected?), and one each as artist, assistant in the National Herbarium, assistant curator, assistant on dictionary, assistant postmaster, astronomer, bookkeeper, bookkeeper and cashier, examiner of bonds, manager, telegraph manager, stenographer and bookkeeper, stenographer and typewriter, combination stenography, teaching and newspaper work, typewriter, writer of advertisements, reviser of patents. While about 38 per cent. of the whole number of respondents are teachers, about 40 per cent. of those earning over $100 a month are teachers.

It is often asked why the majority of self-supporting, educated women continue to enter the profession of teaching. There seems to be good financial reason for it, notwithstanding the enormous competition. Other reasons are that a college graduate can undertake teaching without special training and that it offers large vacations, which are particularly acceptable to women. I have sometimes been told by teachers that the only redeeming feature of their work is the vacation, also that every day of it has to be utilized to get strength enough to go through with the next term. Still, a vacation gives a certain amount of independence. With past social conditions any woman engaging in active work has been almost obliged to forego social life during her period of work. The hours of labor are not those of society. Perhaps for this reason more than any other have cultivated women hesitated to undertake regular employment. They may have liked the work; they may have needed the money; but they were unwilling to sacrifice so much of what makes life worth living. There are signs of coming change. Club life seems to be reforming society along new lines. The constantly increasing army of working women of culture and social ability is compelling readjustments in our ways of thinking and forms of living.

The investigation asked one question, to which for some reason four-ninths of the respondents failed to reply. This is: How does the pay of men performing the same grade of work differ from yours? Of the 250 women who make reply, 150 get less pay than men for the same work, 95 receive the same pay, and 5 women actually receive more pay. The only comment we

can make on this is that the facts are not nearly so bad as we had feared. The cheering information that five women receive more pay than men for the same work deserves analysis. One is employed in a bureau of charities, one is an editor or journalist, one is a proof-reader, and two are actually teachers!

It is often said that men should receive more pay than women because they have families to support. A teacher said to me some years ago that she did not believe there was a woman over thirty years of age earning her own living who did not have some one dependent upon her. She added: "These family obligations are not a matter of choice with women as with men. Men usually incur them by their own marriage; women find families thrust upon them through the marriage of some one else, perhaps of their own parents, years before they were born." Of the 379 women who answer this question about family support, 157 or about 41 per cent. aid in supporting others, while 222 or over 58 per cent. do not. The number of unhampered workers would seem to indicate that many young women, or women of well-to-do parents, are engaged in gainful occupations.

The committee of the A. C. A. were evidently determined to leave no side of the problem of woman's work unturned. It is sometimes alleged that women do not remain continuously in one employment or remain long enough to gain proficiency. There were 333 replies on this subject. Of the whole number of respondents, 214, nearly two-thirds, had followed but one kind of employment since beginning work. They had been at work on an average 7 years and 8 months. There were 88 who had two kinds of work in which they had been engaged 5 years and 4 months each; 19 had had three kinds of work for an average period of 4 years and 8 months; 9 had had four kinds; 2 had had five kinds, while 1 confesses to the extraordinary versatility which enabled her to perform eight kinds of work in succession for an average period of 7 months each. So far as this evidence is worth anything, it shows that the majority of women, when they have once chosen a vocation, stick to it.

In order to throw all the light possible on the reason for the inequality of male and female wages a number of employers were asked for their opinion. Replies were received from 104 employers, 25 from Massachusetts, 25 from California, 15 from Rhode Island, 14 from New York and the remainder from other

States. In their establishments 7,794 persons were employed, 4,697 men and 3,097 women. It must be borne in mind that a large part of the female help could not have been college-women, though it is to be supposed that firms employing college-women were consulted whenever possible.

Of the 90 employers who replied to the question on the comparative value of the services of men and women, 46 said that they were equally valuable, 29 said the services of women were less valuable, 7 made indefinite replies, while 8 answered, "On some work, yes; on other work, no." If this is not all that could be hoped for, it is probably a better showing than could have been made ten years ago. When asked for the reason why women, in general, receive less pay than men for the same work, 67 replied as follows: 29 attribute it to the effect of supply and demand; 21 to physical and mental differences or difference in general ability, while 17 allege custom as an excuse.

I imagine that many of my readers, if they have had interest enough to follow my statements thus far, have done so for the sake of getting a definite answer to the question: Does it pay to send a girl to college? Many a well-to-do father, whose family is living comfortably and spending all he earns, and many a hard-worked mother, who wishes her daughter to have some easier and more remunerative occupation than herself, are anxiously pondering this question. After many years of investigation and observation I can give but an oracular answer. If pecuniary return be the chief motive for sending a girl to college, I should say the venture is as risky as any other business investment.

The necessary expenses at a woman's college are about $500 a year. The charges for board and tuition at Vassar and Wellesley are $400 a year; at Smith and Bryn Mawr, where there is greater variety in the accommodations, the average price is about the same. One hundred dollars is a reasonable sum for books, class and club dues, and necessary incidentals. Clothes and travelling expenses depend upon the individual. I have been told by a woman of wide experience, and my own observation confirms it, that a college woman is doing well if, upon graduation, she can obtain a place to teach for $500 a year without board. A teacher is obliged to dress decently, to live in a respectable quarter of the town, to attend an occasional concert, lecture, or play, and she

ought not to be prohibited from buying books now and then, or taking a trip during vacation. She must manage well if she can do all this, even in a small city, on $500 a year. Of course, unless she is a young woman in comfortable circumstances, boarding at home, she hopes for speedy promotion; but it does not always come. I know of women who have taken advanced degrees at American and foreign universities (and this class is small enough to make its services valuable), who are filling subordinate positions in schools at less than $1,000 a year, and are unable to get any farther. Still, let us always remember that there are two women in this country who are paid a salary of over $300 a month.

It is becoming the fashion to send girls to college. The institutions are filled to overflowing, and at least three of them turn away hundreds of applicants every year for lack of room. A professor of chemistry at a woman's college, asking for enlarged laboratory facilities, said recently: "I am not begging this for myself. The pressure comes from outside. What can we do when well-prepared students insist upon coming?" There is scarcely a man's institution of any importance in the length and breadth of our land that does not admit the feminine mind, singly or in numbers, to some form of co-education, though in many instances the trustees are shy about acknowledging it.

The question, "Ought Woman to Learn the Alphabet?" which Thomas Wentworth Higginson discussed so wittily a quarter of a century ago, is happily settled, at least in this country. It has been proven that the majority of maidens take the baccalaureate degree without injury to health or manners. It has even been proven that a diploma is not necessarily a bar to their matrimonial prospects. Socially, a college woman is almost sure to have opportunities open to her, though sometimes she may be so overworked as to be unable to take advantage of them. For a rich girl a college training offers delightful possibilities. Howells says that we are getting to that state when our women are almost the only class left who have any use for what was once considered the education of a gentleman. Let us hope that some time, and the signs point that way, they may be thought worthy to receive the wages of the workingman.

FRANCES M. ABBOTT.

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM.

BY THE REV. R. F. CLARKE, S.J.

THE doctrines of Malthus respecting the growth of population, and its relation to the simultaneous increase in the means of subsistence, are now very generally discredited. His calculation that the population of a country doubles itself under normal circumstances in a quarter of a century, while the food for its support, instead of in any way keeping pace with it, advances only in accordance with the tardier laws of arithmetical progression, is not borne out by subsequent economists. The single precept which was the practical result of his investigations, "Abstain from marriage until you have sufficient means to support your family in comfort," is justly considered to introduce evils far worse than those which it was intended to remedy. It would have an injurious effect on the general morality and would tend to the degradation of a larger proportion of the female population.

But the difficulties arising from the rapid increase of population have not diminished since the days of Malthus. The decay of the warlike spirit, and the ever advancing appreciation of the blessings of peace, have removed, at least for a time, one of the chief agencies tending to keep down the number of human beings on the face of the earth. The improved sanitary condition of all civilized countries has been instrumental in bringing about an almost entire cessation of the fatal epidemics which decimated Europe during the middle ages. The wonderful discoveries of medical science have co-operated in various ways to the preservation of human life. The greater skill and knowledge of the modern leech has saved the lives of thousands who would otherwise have perished long before they had arrived at the term of years allotted to man by the Psalmist, and of tens of

thousands who in former times would never have seen the light, or have faded away in their infancy or early childhood. The death-rate of almost all civilized nations tends continually to become less, and that in spite of the feebler constitutions and earlier signs of decay that are the lot of the present generation.

We, therefore, have still to face the dangers of over-population. The crowding of the most active and enterprising of the country people into the large cities has aggravated the difficulties of the situation. It is true that the discovery of steam has told in the opposite direction. It has increased enormously the facilities for emigration, and has opened to the surplus population of an overcrowded country fields of labor that were quite inaccessible to them before. It has also made easy the transport of all the necessaries of life from the very ends of the earth, and the proletariat of London have a far better supply of cheap provision in the present day than they had half a century ago.

Yet there certainly exists a widely prevalent apprehension that a continuance of the present increase will some day either bring about a catastrophe, or entail a terrible amount of misery and degradation in the more thickly inhabited countries of the world. Men profess to discover, here and there, at least the first commencement of the impending evils; and they urge the adoption of some means, if any such can be found, of checking the rapidity of the increase. Malthusianism has failed, but a new school has arisen to whom we may give the name of "Neo-Malthusians," who while they reject the system proposed by Malthus, substitute for it a corresponding system of their own, which they think will avert the danger by surer and wiser means.

This new school does not desire to defer the period of marriage, as Malthus did. On the contrary, they rather encourage, within reasonable limits, the prevalence of early unions. They advocate the hindrance of a too rapid growth of the population, not by postponing conjugal felicity, but by a voluntary restriction on the part of married persons, of the number of children born to them. They recognize fully the evils attending any artificial bar to wedlock, but deny that the married state necessarily entails an unlimited offspring. They assert that ordinary prudence requires that we should not bring into the world those for whom we have not the means of providing, and they denounce, perhaps sometimes in rather unmeasured language, the

cruelty and wickedness of deliberately disregarding the future well-being of our own flesh and blood, and of producing children who in the ordinary course of things are destined to either absolute or comparative pauperism.

If these reformers simply sought to enforce by their counsels such a separation between husband and wife as would ensure the end they have in view, if after the birth of just such a number of children as they believe they can bring up in their own station, they were henceforward to live as brother and sister, we should not have so much to say against their proposal. We could not approve of it. "Want of intercourse," says the great philosopher of antiquity, "has destroyed many a friendship," and this is more true of the friendship of married persons than of any other. A coldness and distance is apt to spring up between them. The wife ceases to be to her husband the "wife of his bosom." They are no longer of one heart and one soul, and become almost like strangers to each other. There is, moreover, the continual danger that one or other of them will seek a closer friendship elsewhere, and that passion will find unlawful indulgence in some forbidden way. The separation, moreover, is in a large majority of cases impracticable. It is only the upper class whose houses admit of its being effectually carried out. We may, therefore, put it aside as impossible for the masses, and undesirable in all but a few exceptional instances.

But this is not all that the Neo-Malthusians propose. They are no mere theorists, but practical men, bent on spreading their opinions far and wide. They do not ask husband and wife to live apart, but to live on as before, providing only certain preventive checks, which shall effectually put a stop to any further increase in their family, except in so far as they themselves may choose. They not only justify the adoption of such means in their own case, but recommend it to others. Already preventive checks are largely prevalent in France, and to this is in great measure due the stationary numbers of the population. In some parts of America Neo-Malthusianism is said to have made considerable progress, and to have been instrumental in the gradual diminution of many of the old families of the New England States, which stands out in striking contrast to the rapid growth of the immigrant portion of the inhabitants. In England such practises are on the increase, and seem likely

to spread still more rapidly, on account of the zealous propagandism of many of their supporters, and the decay of religious belief among those who are called "orthodox Protestants." If the doctrines of the Neo-Malthusians are unlawful, and injurious to a country, it is full time that those who lament their prevalence should come forward to bear witness against them, and to show how ruinous are the consequences that will be their ultimate result.

Here we have to remember that those with whom we have to argue are not to be influenced by arguments based on religious dogma or on the pronouncements of authority. It is quite useless to tell them that what they advocate is opposed to the law of nature. Many of them do not recognize the existence of any *a priori* natural law, but say that what we know by that name is but a collection of generalizations from experience as to what is and what is not promotive of the general good. If you quote Holy Scripture against them, they will find a ready evasion in the special circumstances of the age, or perhaps will deny the binding character of the inference drawn from the Sacred Text. If you tell them that the means they propose are crimes which call down the anger of God, they will simply smile incredulously. If you appeal to their moral sense, they will assure you that it approves of their proceedings, and that a positive sense of guilt would arise in them if they were guilty of the reckless procreation of children whom they did not see their way to provide for. We must therefore take them on their own ground, and show that all religious and moral considerations apart, the practices they advocate are not only quite unnecessary to the well being of society, but absolutely ruinous to the welfare of mankind, most injurious to morality and productive of the very evils that they are intended to check.

We have then, first of all, to examine into the existence and causes of the evils to be remedied. The widely spread poverty and misery of our large cities, with all the social and moral degradation they entail, constitute, unhappily, a fact that no one can deny. But before we conclude that this is the result of the too rapid increase of the population, we must inquire of those who have the widest experience of the poorer classes, what are in general the causes of destitution among them. If we find that large families and wretched homes are invariably found

together, then the connection between the number of children and the ensuing misery or semi-starvation would be clearly established. Or if, again, those cities and districts where the numbers have increased the most rapidly, and where the inhabitants are most closely packed, are those which witness the greatest amount of suffering from extreme poverty, this, too, would indicate a connection of cause and effect between rapid growth and dense population on the one hand, and depressed economic conditions on the other. This is a matter in which we must look not to what the theorist tells us *must be* the case, but to what an examination of the facts tells us *is* the case.

I believe the experience of everyone who lives and has lived among the poor, whether it be Catholic priest or Protestant clergyman, Sister of Charity or district visitor, charity organization agent or Brother of St. Vincent de Paul, will bear me out in my conviction that nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine-hundredths, of the actual destitution among the poor is to be traced, directly or indirectly, to habits of drink. It is not, as a general rule, the drunkard himself who has to pay the heaviest penalty, at least in this world, for his intemperance. It is too often the helpless wife and the neglected children who have to bear the burden of their father's sin. There is scarcely a city or a town in the whole world from which all abject poverty would not practically disappear if the vice of drunkenness could be banished. Of course there are, besides, a number of instances of destitution in no way connected with drink. The sudden death or long illness of the breadwinner of the family will, from time to time, cause a very acute phase of misery and want. The poor helpless mother, with her hungry brood, is as sad a sight as well can be. But such cases are exceptional, and men do not legislate for exceptions. Such needs can easily be met, and are met in every well organized community, by Christian charity. They are also of their very nature only temporary. Even the poor widow left destitute with half a dozen little ones, if she is at all deserving, is sure to find friends and obtain employment. The pinch of poverty may be severe for a time, but in our complex civilization there is work for all who have willing hands and an honest heart. Add to this that the advance of habits of thrift, the increased facilities for insurance, and the growing sense of the duty of pro-

viding for such contingencies, make the occurrence of acute cases of unforeseen distress tend continually to diminish.

There is another point that is worth considering. Does a large family tend in the long run to greater poverty? It may for the first few years after marriage. But this is not, as a rule, the time when the pinch is felt. Both father and mother are in the prime of their health and strength, and the difficulty of finding sufficient means of support is, in the case of the industrious and sober, exceedingly rare. It is usually in later life that the pinch comes, if it comes at all. It is when middle age, or a life of hard labor, or some unforeseen sickness or accident, brings with it a lessened energy, and the need of more generous living. It is when the hair begins to grow gray, and the once upright form is bowed by advancing years, that hunger and poverty are most to be dreaded.

At this later stage of the career of the bread-winner of the family is the presence of a copious brood most often a help or a hindrance? I think that most of those who have had a practical experience of the life of the poor in our large towns and cities will agree with me that the contributions of the children, as time goes on, are in a large majority of instances a very material assistance to the comfort of its older members. When the big boys and girls are able to work in the shops or in the mills, the family income tends steadily to increase, within certain limits, with the increasing offspring. We often find families whose combined income is so large that they are able to enjoy not only all the necessaries, but also the comforts of life, and to form, besides, a little reserve fund if they are thrifty. Such families would be reckoned by tens of thousands in the large towns, both in America and England, if it were not that in too many cases the public-house, instead of the savings bank, is the inheritor of their surplus earnings, and robs them of all the comforts and a portion of the very necessities of life. But if the parents are temperate, and bring up their children well, the increasing numbers will, after a certain period, mean increasing resources just at the time when father and mother are beginning to be less able to fight their way amid the difficulties of life, and in the presence, it may be, of bodily infirmities.

This consideration is of still more telling force when old age overtakes the father and mother, and they look for some means

of support in their declining years other than that provided by the cruel, comfortless shelter of the poor-house. It is easy to say that, with a limited family, they will have had opportunity of laying up some provision for the years when they can work no longer. This is beautiful in theory; but every practical man knows that, in point of fact, the number of the poor who can be induced to save is still comparatively small. Unless the state renders some insurance with a view to old age compulsory (and to this there are many objections), nine-tenths of the poor will be found, when their powers fail, without any pecuniary support for the concluding years of life. When this time shall arrive, they must look for help to one or other of their children. Their chance of being maintained in comfort will depend on their having one or more of their offspring able and willing to support them. In these circumstances, it stands to reason that the advantage will on the whole be distinctly on the side of those who have a numerous progeny. If a man has half a dozen children, there is a far better chance of one of them being the stay of his old age than if he has only two or three. The Neo-Malthusians would perhaps answer that the two or three would on their system be far better off than the members of the larger family of those who reject their teaching. Even if this were so, (and we are not sure that there would be much difference, or that the paucity of their numbers would be compensated by their superior resources), we fear that the principle of selfishness that underlies the Neo-Malthusian doctrines would not tend to any self-sacrifice on the part of the children for their parents' sake. But when an aged couple have some half-dozen sons and daughters, some at home and some abroad, some, it may be, married, and some still single, experience teaches us that in a majority of cases, there are found some one or more who count it a privilege to help their parents from far or near.

There is also another fallacy underlying the doctrines of the Neo-Malthusians. When they speak of the iniquity of bringing into the world children whom you have no reasonable prospect of supporting, they are using language which is applicable at most only to the poorest class in the community. Even among them, if the opinions I have expressed above are correct, the chance of bringing into the world little ones to starve is practically limited to those who, through their intemperance or sloth, themselves

create the very evil which these new doctrines pretend to meet. Was there ever, or, at all events, is there to be found now in any city on the face of the earth, any considerable number of individuals who, without any fault of their own, are unable to provide a sufficiency of food for their little ones? Putting aside certain accidental and transitory circumstances, the half-starved children have almost invariably a drunken, or else a hopelessly idle, father or mother. Surely it is not for these that the Neo-Malthusian would legislate. He knows well enough that the same causes that robbed the children of their bread would render nugatory any check on the numbers of their offspring, and that his sage advice will only take effect on those who are well able to supply to their families at least all the necessaries of life. Or if he answer that what he has in view is not so much to preclude the birth of children literally in danger of starvation, as to give to the offspring of a rather higher class a better start in life, and the opportunity of a more thorough education, he in no way improves his position. The danger of the present day does not lie in the direction of a neglect of the education of the children of parents of the artisan and the lower middle classes. More education is one of the panaceas of the modern reformer, and we have no cause to think that he will diminish in his zeal as time goes on. If, however, our Neo-Malthusian friends go further, and declare that it is the duty of every parent to make some pecuniary provision for his children, we do not believe that such a duty will ever be recognized by the common sense of mankind, or indeed that under ordinary circumstances it exists at all. How many have been ruined by the fact that they have never been compelled to rely on their own resources, and that they have had their path in life made smooth for them just at the time when the wholesome necessity of immediate exertion would have trained them to habits of industry for a lifetime?

I have said that in our complex civilization there is work for all who have willing hands and an honest heart. This proposition is one that will perhaps be disputed. We have heard a great deal of late of the "submerged tenth," and of the starving crowds who would fain work if there were work to do. This is a matter in which every man must speak from his own experience. After a life spent for the most part in London and other cities of England, where the labor market is supposed to be overglutted, I

must confess that I do not believe that this is really the case. I am convinced that even in London there is room for every one. A man or woman who is not utterly incapable, or so hopelessly demoralized as to be unable to persevere in any sort of continuous occupation, need scarcely ever remain long unemployed. In the manufacturing towns of the north of England and of Scotland, there is often more work to be done than there are hands to do it. The children are set to work as half-timers as soon as the law permits of their employment, and the abundance of work is a temptation to parents to send their children to the mills when they ought to be at school. A family where there are a number of big boys and girls can earn a collective income that would keep them not only in comfort, but in luxury, if it were not for the curse of drink. Any one who knows the inner life of Manchester, St. Helens, Dundee, Glasgow, and many similar towns will tell you that there is plenty of money going in all of them, and that the poverty, hunger, dirt, disease, the ragged children, overcrowded houses, beggars in the streets, paupers in the workhouse, are to be traced, not to overpopulation, but (allowing for exceptional cases, such as we have noted above) almost invariably to drink. One of the most wonderful achievements of modern enterprise is the extraordinary cheapness of all the necessaries of life in the large cities of Great Britain. Bread, meat, vegetables, fruit, teas, sugar, butter (or its substitutes) are brought in abundance from the very ends of the earth, and are mostly far lower in price than when the numbers to be supplied with food were far less than they are now. While the rate of wages has steadily advanced; while the struggles between employers and employed has, in a large majority of instances, terminated in favor of the latter; all that is absolutely necessary for the physical well-being of the employed has, with the exception of house rent, come more within the reach of all than it ever was before. I speak, indeed, with some hesitation respecting the change that has taken place in American cities in this respect, because my knowledge of them is merely that of a passing visitor; but this at least I think I am safe in asserting, that in spite of the recent depression of trade, and the hardships it has entailed in many cities on the working class, the material advantages of European cities are far more plentiful across the Atlantic, that the wage rate is higher, the necessaries of life cheaper, and the facilities

for finding employment far greater in Cincinnati, Pittsburg, Chicago, or even in New York itself, than they are in Glasgow, Manchester or London. If there is overpopulation anywhere, it is in Europe, not in America; if there are countries that are overcrowded, they are the countries of the Old World, not of the New.

What do we mean by overpopulation? I imagine that we mean that the number of inhabitants on every square mile is greater than what the country can support. If we examine the statistics of European population we find that the most crowded of European countries is Belgium. The average of inhabitants throughout the country is in Belgium 461 to the square mile, whereas it is in England and Wales 389, in France 181, and in Germany 205. If, therefore, overpopulation produces misery and want we ought to find in Belgium a maximum amount of these evils.

So far from this being the case, Belgium is one of the most happy, contented, and prosperous countries in the world. On the other hand, Ireland, which has lost half of its inhabitants in the course of the last fifty years, is the country where extreme poverty and destitution prevails, to an extent unknown elsewhere. It is true that the circumstances of Ireland are exceptional, but at least that country furnishes an answer to those who would have us believe that it is overcrowding which is at the root of all widely prevalent destitution, and that if we can only prevent a too rapid growth of mouths there will be more meat to put into them. The fact is that the facilities of transport are in the present day so enormously increased, that any labor market that happens to be overstocked soon pours its surplus into another that is not so well provided with hands to work it. The transfer may not be possible in a day or a week. Meanwhile, there may be a considerable amount of temporary distress. But the evil will soon remedy itself. President Walker, in a recent article, complains bitterly of the ever-increasing opportunities that are afforded to those who cannot find suitable employment in Europe for seeking a fresh home across the Atlantic! "The organization," he says, "of the European railway and steamship service is now such as to reduce almost to a minimum the energy, courage, intelligence, and pecuniary means required for immigration; a result which is tending to bring us no longer the

more alert and enterprising members of their respective communities, but rather the unlucky, the thriftless, the worthless." The bold proposal of General Booth to found a self-supporting colony beyond the sea, whither are to be gathered the surplus of the home population, the assisted passages to Australia and the Cape, and the rapid opening out of Africa, point to fresh fields for those who fail of a sufficiency of employment, or of an employment sufficiently remunerative to satisfy them, at home.

We must also bear in mind that almost every country in the world is becoming capable, year by year, of accommodating a larger number of inhabitants. Improved methods of agriculture, the utilization of sewage, the cultivation, and the profitable cultivation, of large tracts of land that were before considered hopeless, the draining of marshes, and the reclamation of land from the sea and from inland lakes, the possibility of obtaining a profit from the most sandy and unpromising soil, all enable mankind to be closer packed than formerly without fear of want. There is no reason to suppose that we have come to the end of these improvements, and if men threaten us with the terror of a population which multiplies faster than the means of subsistence can be multiplied, we answer by denying the supposed disproportion in the rate of increase, by reason not only of the ever improving productiveness of the soil, but also on account of the larger area under cultivation at home, to say nothing of the stream of cheap food that is continually flowing into our ports from abroad.

There is, however, a far more serious objection to the preventive checks proposed by the Neo-Malthusians. For they are not only unnecessary, but they would soon bring about a social degradation far more injurious than the exaggerated and somewhat imaginary dangers of overpopulation. I am not speaking now of evils which are regarded as such from a Christian point of view, but I allude simply to social and moral evils that would be considered such even by one who did not believe in a God or a future life. For the proposal of this new school is the adoption of some means which, without enforcing any sort of separation between husband and wife, would effectually prevent the birth of any more children, as soon as the parents decided that they had enough. The adoption of these preventive checks are regarded by the Neo-Malthusians not only as lawful, but as a

duty to themselves and to their children, if they cannot look forward with sufficient certainty to being able to provide for their offspring in their own station in life. The neglect of this supposed duty they denounce as a crime. The following passage in an article by Mr. Ernest Bowden is a good example of Neo-Malthusian sentiments :

"When a parent who might decently rear a small family, calmly ignores the claims of his existing offspring, and so increases his family that, as often happens, one of his earlier children simply dies of poverty, how can he be logically acquitted of the barbarous manslaughter of his own child? . . . Surely the more our heart is touched by the wail of distress from our fellow-creatures, the more keenly must we feel the downright wickedness of bringing a fresh human being into the world, if he have not at least a reasonable chance of leading a good and happy life."

Now let us suppose that this kind of teaching were to prevail, and consider what its consequences would be. It appeals to the educated class most of all, to those who are provident and who have a care for the future, to those who are capable of self-control, and have a keen sense of their duties to posterity. Such men will be the few and not the many. They will be men who have achieved for themselves and their families some sort of position, or who inherit resources which they feel bound to hand on in their integrity to their children. They will be (I am speaking from a Neo-Malthusian standpoint) the prudent, the temperate, the self-relying, the self-restrained. These will be the men who will have very small families and who will make it their object to prevent too rapid an increase of their race, as far as it lies in their power. And who, on the other hand, will be the class who in the halcyon days when Neo-Malthusianism is preached in public will be the reckless offenders against its teaching? They will be those who are too careless and degraded to follow its precepts. They will be the vicious, the intemperate, those whose animal instincts are too strong to be subject to considerations of prudence. Will the drunkard take the advice of this new school? Will those who are sunk in abject poverty, who are degraded and indifferent to all considerations, save the inclinations of the moment, pay any heed to these new teachers? The Neo-Malthusian doctrines will simply fall on deaf ears, and will have no practical effect whatever.

What will follow, then, from the wider spread of this teaching, and from the conversion to it of all prudent and thoughtful

men? Why, simply this, that the higher type of the race will gradually die out, and the lower type will increase and mutiply all the more rapidly, by reason of the comparative fewness of those who otherwise would by reason of their superior nature form a powerful middle class, into which the lower type would make their way only in exceptional cases. The strength of a nation is not so much in its upper class, at least in the present day, as in an intelligent, energetic, honest, sober, industrious middle class. It is this which constitutes the strength of America, England, France, and Germany. The comparative absence of it is the weakness of Southern Europe, and also of South America. Anything that tends to increase the proletariat and to diminish the middle class, is a distinct injury to a nation. Anything that exalts this class into a less numerous but more wealthy upper-middle or upper class, is a distinct loss of strength and vigor. This would be especially the case when the very process of diminution involved the exercise of continual prudence and self-restraint, and the adoption of means which would only be attractive to those who were sufficiently endowed with the bump of caution to take measures against an evil which is always doubtful and generally far away.

Now this would be the infallible consequence of the prevalence of Neo-Malthusian doctrines. However widely spread, they would never be adopted into the daily life of the very class whom it is most important to diminish. The utterly careless and improvident, the intemperate, the reckless would increase as before; while the respectable and the far-seeing, the men who desired to make for themselves a good position, and to leave to their children a suitable provision would be those who would be anxious that their children should not be sufficiently numerous to hinder either their own comfort, or the future welfare of their offspring. Thus, if we suppose two families, one of which is limited by the parents to three children, while the other in the absence of any such limit has twice that number—if, moreover, the same rate of increase for similar reasons is maintained for six generations—the respective numbers, when the sixth generation is reached will be 729 on the one hand, and 46,656 on the other. If we suppose one-half of the more prolific race to have perished, on account of the greater rate of mortality in comparison with their more favored rivals, it would still leave the inferior type in

a majority of 30 to 1. In this way Neo-Malthusian doctrines are of a most retrograde character. So far from tending to the welfare of the human race, they tend to a steady deterioration of it. They would, in the natural course of things, bring us back to a class of plutocrats on the one hand, few in numbers, but possessed of superior natures and plenteous wealth, and on the other a continually augmenting class of the poor and the degraded with all the dangerous elements that follow from this class being sufficiently numerous to swamp those who belong to the nobler race.

This is not the only danger with which we are threatened if the doctrines of the Neo-Malthusians are to be generally accepted. They start with a denial of the binding character of what is termed the natural law, and say that the code which bears this name is but the result of a long series of generalizations from experience, which have for their object to discover what tends to promote the happiness and what the misery of the human race. In early days, they say, the rapid increase of the human race tended to the general happiness, and, therefore, what is called the natural law approved the procreation of a large family. Now, however, it is just the opposite. The rapid increase of the human family is most injurious to the general happiness, and, therefore, we assert that it is equally true that the natural law forbids it as that it once encouraged it. The natural law thus loses its absolute character and varies with varying circumstances. If this is to be granted, we must carry on the argument a little farther. In former times the natural law forbade the parent to destroy any of his children. There was plenty of room for all, and the selfishness of those who exposed, or took away the life of, the children they did not care to support was calculated to injure the common interests of the race. But now all this is changed. The curtailment of the family is (say the Neo-Malthusians) most desirable. Why, then, should the parent who has children whom he cannot bring up as he ought, be compelled to burden himself with them? Why should not he be allowed to dispose of those whom he has called into existence? Is it any kindness to bring them up with the almost certain prospect of misery and destitution before them? If man has a right over the laws of life, in that he can, by artificial means, prevent the accomplishment of what the law of nature declares to be the primary end of his own action, why should he not exert a similar sway over the life of

which he regards himself as the author? The danger of too wholesale an employment of this latter right is safeguarded against by the strong instinct of parental affection. But where this affection would display itself in the merciful cutting short of a life which threatens to be one of suffering and destitution, why punish the parent, if he refuses to prolong the life that can hardly fail to be doomed to a life-long misery? Take, for example, the case of a posthumous child born to some poor widow. She is herself starving. Already she has several little ones crying to her for bread and she has none to give them. Her new-born infant is puny and sickly and suffering. What is its prospect of a happy life? Why may she not add one drop more to the soothing draught she is giving it, and so induce, gently and without a pang, a peaceful sleep from which there shall be no awaking? If once we admit any exception to that absolute law within, which we call the natural law, surely such a case as this is one which justifies, and even renders praiseworthy, the action of the mother, who, out of love for her little one, forbids it to persevere in so unpromising an existence.

In other words, the consequence of Neo-Malthusian doctrines would be gradually to abolish the sanctity of human life, and to condone or rather to sanction and approve deliberate murder. Utilitarianism cuts at the root of every law of which we cannot perceive, with our dim and short sighted vision, the practical value. Once refuse to acknowledge as immutable and eternal the sanctions of nature's laws, and we shall soon find ourselves involved in a downward path leading to the dark abysses of pagan morality and pagan crime. Once turn away from the natural light that enlightens every man that comes into the world, and we soon find ourselves involved in the thick darkness that covered the earth when the code of heathen civilization had taken the place of the laws of God.

There is still another consequence that would follow from the course of conduct advocated by the new school. Around the purity of women God has placed certain safeguards. The consciousness of the disgrace that is likely to accompany any serious violation of the law of purity aids not a little to create even among those who are careless of the mere offense against God, a strong traditional instinct in favor of virtue. The knowledge of the consequences that may ensue, has, in point of fact, saved

thousands from falling who otherwise would have fallen. The motive, it is true, was not a very exalted one, but it has often proved effectual where all higher motives failed. But—what is perhaps still more important—it has aided not a little in the formation of a potent and very healthy public opinion on the importance of maidenly integrity. The great difference that generally prevails between the appreciation of the value of purity to boys and girls, is a curious proof of this. There is no real distinction between the sin committed in the one case and the other; yet the world regards the indulgence of the passions as little more than a youthful foible in the young man, while in a young woman it is looked upon as an indelible disgrace.

Now, if this potent motive were to disappear, if sin could be committed without the immediate punishment which under present circumstances is liable to follow on it, if the terrible consequence of a fall were not present to the eyes of those whose frailty is at present only too prone to yield, and whose fear of God and hatred of sin is, alas! not sufficient to keep them to the paths of virtue, should we not have reason to fear a terrible increase of sexual license, and a gradual disappearance of that dread of sin which is to a great extent a healthy outcome of the fear of its consequences? We fear that already the poison of these new doctrines is spreading among the middle class both in Europe and America, and side by side with their wider circulation there is a continually diminishing love of purity, and a cynical depreciation of that jewel of innocence which even the heathen world regarded as a priceless treasure.

The conclusions then to which we find ourselves compelled to arrive are these:

1. The Neo-Malthusian doctrines would tend to produce the very evils that they are supposed to prevent, viz.: The growth of a large proletariat on the one side and the development side by side with it, of a small, but wealthy class of capitalists, continually diminishing in numbers as compared with the ignorant and undisciplined mass around them, but increasing rapidly in intelligence and material prosperity. This is a strange ideal for these new teachers to look forward to, but it is one that, according to their own showing, must certainly ensue.

2. There would gradually follow from the disregard and violation of what we call the natural law, other consequences, which

were common enough in pagan times, but are now universally condemned even by those who reject the teaching of Christianity, such as the exposure or murder of children whom it was inconvenient to the parents to maintain.

3. There would also go hand in hand with these new doctrines a steady depreciation of the importance of feminine purity, and a growing indulgence of the lower instincts, recklessly and without any fear of future consequences such as now prevails. These dangers are moreover to be incurred in order to meet an evil which is (speaking generally) not the result of overpopulation at all, but of other causes, of which the most fertile are drunkenness and laziness.

We cannot help suspecting, if the truth were known, that Neo-Malthusianism is but an excuse for selfishness after all. The pleasures of parentage are chiefly confined to the first two or three children. As life goes on the little stranger who makes its appearance from time to time is rather a burden than a delight to father and mother alike. All the fine talk of the duty we owe to our unborn children, or to children who ought to be unborn, is but a well disguised expression of a desire to be rid, as far as circumstances allow, of the hardships and self-sacrifice that a large family is wont to bring with it. If, by some impossible arrangement, a man himself were to be comfortably off in exact proportion to the number of his children, we should not hear much more of the duty that he owes to them, or the wickedness of bringing into existence those whose after lives may prove a burden to them.

I have argued this question on its own merits, quite apart from the claims of the natural law, or from any consideration of the fear of God. But I cannot conclude without reminding my readers that the practices advocated by the Neo-Malthusians are most serious offences against Nature and Nature's God. In the eyes of men those who are guilty of them may pass for honorable and virtuous citizens, but in the eyes of Him who sees in secret, the poor wanderer in the streets is far less culpable than those who thus set at naught, for the sake of their own comfort and enjoyment, the laws that God has laid down to regulate the increase of the human kind.

R. F. CLARKE, S. J.

THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.

BY THE HON. WARNER MILLER AND THE HON. RICHARD P. BLAND.

I.

It seldom happens that differences existing between political parties are such as to raise the question of loyalty, on the part of either, to the fundamental principles of our government.

Parties usually divide on matters of administration, on revenue and method of producing it, on the powers of the general government and the rights of the several States.

But once in our history has any political party been disloyal, and then the majority of that party in the Northern States rallied to the support of the government, and gave invaluable aid in the contest for its preservation.

A government may be as certainly destroyed or revolutionized by peaceable methods through the ballot box as by war.

Our government is not paternal; it gives the largest amount of liberty to each individual consistent with the general welfare; it protects individuals in the exercise of political and religious liberty; it has made it easier for our citizens to acquire and hold property than under any other form of government; it protects the right of private contract among its people by constitutional provisions; it treats its citizens honestly and demands that they shall be honest with the government and with each other.

To protect the people against possible usurpation of power by either the legislative or the executive departments of the government it has provided a court of last resort, which shall judge of the acts of both of these departments and determine whether they are in conformity with the Constitution. This court is a most important part of our system.

Legislatures come and go, executives serve a fixed and limited term, but the Supreme Court, while changing its individual members, will continue in an unbroken line as long as the government shall exist. It is the real guardian of our rights and liberties as set forth in the Constitution.

All these principles of government are at issue in the present campaign. For the first time in our history a political party has openly proposed to debase and cheapen our currency; for the first time the right of private contract is condemned and laws are demanded to prevent it; in certain cases for the first time the Supreme Court is attacked and its re-organization threatened; for the first time the demand is made that private property shall be taken for public use without proper compensation.

The party which met in convention early in July, miscalled the Democratic party, threatens the country, if successful, with all of these evils.

The Populist party, which met in St. Louis a few days later, not only endorsed all that was done at Chicago, but went still farther in its attack upon our system of government as it has existed from the beginning, and pronounced against the preservation of law and order, and the safety of our property and people through the regularly established and heretofore unquestioned functions of our government.

Mr. Bryan was nominated for the presidency at both of these conventions. It has been said that he secured the nomination at Chicago by his oratory, but this is a mistake; that convention was dominated absolutely by the Populistic sentiment which had gained control of the organization of the Democratic party, and it nominated Mr. Bryan because he was a Populist and not a Democrat of the old school. The Populist Convention at St. Louis nominated him because he was the real leader of their party, and more than any other man represented their theories of government. If any proof is needed of this statement let his speeches in Congress, his speeches on the stump in his own State, and his editorial writings furnish the evidence.

The Populist Convention failed to endorse as its candidate for Vice-President Mr. Sewall, who had been put in nomination at Chicago, because he was not a Populist, or at least had up to that time never given any evidence of his being a believer in their doctrines.

Opposed to this candidate and to his Populistic principles we have William McKinley, nominated at a Republican Convention held in St. Louis early in June. The history of the Republican party from its organization down to the present time is a sufficient guarantee of its continued loyalty to the principles of our Constitution, but in this emergency it has spoken upon all of these questions with no uncertain sound.

The candidate himself has made a record during his long years of public service which is a sufficient pledge that the principles of his party, as laid down in the platform adopted at St. Louis, will be honestly and fearlessly carried out in his administration, and in public speech since his nomination he has given pledges of his support of the platform.

The proposition to debase and cheapen our money is found in the demand of the Populists for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The avowed object of this is to scale down all the debts both national and private 50 per cent.

In the war for the preservation of the Union we contracted a national debt of nearly three thousand millions of dollars; we borrowed this money upon the best terms that we could, the rate depending from day to day upon the success or defeat of the Union armies, and the faith of the world as to our success.

We pledged the world that we would pay our debt in the honest money of the world. When the war closed some faint-hearted and dishonest people advised the repudiation of the entire debt; others quite as dishonest at heart, but not so bold in statement, demanded that the debt should be paid in greenbacks or fiat money; but the loyal men of our country vastly outnumbered the dishonest cowards, and we have gone on paying our debt and interest in gold or its equivalent, until to-day less than one-third of the debt remains to be liquidated.

After this record for honesty and fair dealing shall we scale down the remainder of the debt to 50 cents on the dollar, and thus forever tarnish and blacken our record as a people?

The Populist platform demands that the government shall be permitted to liquidate this debt in a depreciated currency. We still owe a great debt to the soldiers of the late war in the form of pensions. Shall we scale down that debt also to 50 cents on the dollar? That is what the Populists demand. Or shall we continue

to pay these pensions in the same money with which we have paid our bonds and the interest ?

The Republican party in its platform and Mr. McKinley in his public speeches have declared against the free coinage of silver and for the maintenance of currency upon a parity with gold.

This silver question reduces itself to a simple matter of common honesty between the government and its people and between private individuals.

If an individual fails in business, and is not able to pay his debts in full he may make a compromise with his creditors, if they are willing to accept it, of fifty cents on the dollar, or for any other amount that may be mutually agreed upon ; but this is a proposition to make such a compromise by the force of law.

Those who are in favor of that course will support the Populists and Mr. Bryan, but those who are in favor of honesty cannot do otherwise than support Mr. McKinley for President.

The proposition of Mr. Bryan for the free coinage of silver or the making of a fifty-cent dollar is only half the truth of what he and his followers propose.

Mr. Bryan as a member of Congress recommended the issuing of fiat money by the government upon the ground that the people would save, first, the interest upon the money, and, secondly, if the money was not redeemed that they would save the principal also ; and the Populist Convention at St. Louis demanded that the general government should issue fiat money ; it should be full legal tender for all debts both public and private, and that "efficient means should be furnished for its distribution direct to the people." This is nothing more nor less than repudiation of all the debts of the government.

The payment of the debts of the government by the issuing of fiat money, without provision for its redemption in coin, is simple robbery under the forms of law. Can there be any question as to where our loyal citizens would stand upon such a proposition ? There should be none, and I do not believe there is.

The attack upon the integrity of the Supreme Court is even more dangerous than the attack upon the currency.

This court is removed from the influence of partisan strife as absolutely as any body of men can be. It has always held the respect and confidence of the people ; and its decisions have been received and obeyed as the supreme law of the land.

The attack upon it is based upon two acts—the declaration of the late income tax law as unconstitutional and the use of the court for the suppression of a great riot known as the "Debs Riot."

The action of the United States Court in the matter of the Debs Riot has been condemned by every Anarchist, every Socialist, every Communist, and every Populist in the country.

What are the facts?

A great riot took place in Chicago; the United States mails were stopped and all inter-State commerce passing through that great city was suspended; the Governor of the State refused to do his duty because he was in sympathy with the rioters; the Mayor of the city failed to do his duty for the same reason; the federal government was appealed to to protect the carrying of the mails and to enable inter-State commerce to be carried on without interruption.

The court, through the proper exercise of its powers, forbade all persons from interfering with the movement of the mails and with commerce, and when the rioters failed to obey that order, the President of the United States, exercising his just powers under the Constitution, ordered out the army of the United States, suppressed the riot, arrested the leaders, moved the mails, and set the wheels of inter-State commerce in motion.

Had this not been done the riot would have succeeded; it would doubtless have grown into a civil war; it would have destroyed Chicago and untold millions of property of the citizens of the United States, and doubtless thousands of lives would have been sacrificed.

In suppressing this riot and demonstrating the power of the federal government to protect its own people and their rights President Cleveland performed an act which, in my judgment, will, in the centuries to come, do more for the preservation and maintenance of our institutions than any single act of any President since the close of the late Civil War.

As the population of this country increases, its discordant elements, the Anarchists and the Socialists of the old world, will doubtless come here in larger numbers than ever before, and under our free system of public discussion and public agitation they will attempt more and more to spread their doctrines among our people; then this power of the federal government to protect itself,

its citizens, and its functions will of necessity be called into action, and the course followed by President Cleveland at Chicago will be a sufficient precedent for all future administrations.

Can any patriotic American citizen hesitate as to whether he shall give his suffrage to the man who stands for the defence of our liberties through the Supreme Court, or whether he shall give his suffrage to the man who condemns the Supreme Court and upholds the right of riot and civil discord ?

In both the platforms, the one adopted at Chicago and the one adopted by the Populists at St. Louis, the right of private contract is attacked and a demand made that laws shall be passed limiting it. This right has always been sustained by our courts ; it is a right of the very highest importance to the private citizen, and should be maintained at any cost or sacrifice.

McKinley stands for the inviolability of contracts ; Bryan stands for all that is opposed to that principle.

The Populists demand that the government shall take and operate our railroads ; if the government takes the railroads it must exercise the right of eminent domain.

The Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use except by just compensation to the owner.

The value of our railroads is a vast sum—some three or four times more than the entire national debt at the close of the war.

They are owned, not by a few people ; but hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our people are interested in the stock and bonds of these corporations. The government cannot pay for them in money, unless it creates fiat money and compels the present owners of these railroads to take it.

If it issues bonds it cannot compel the owners of the railroad securities to exchange them for the government bonds ; it must put its bonds upon the market and sell them to the highest bidder and pay for the railroads with the money thus secured. No one having knowledge of finance believes for a moment that this can be done. There remains no way by which the government can take these railroads except by confiscation and by compelling the present owners to accept fiat money for the securities which they now hold.

When we speak of this as a dishonest transaction we use mild terms ; it is simply robbery committed by the power of a great government which no private citizen is able to resist.

The theories of the Populists are only partially discussed in their platform. Associated with them are all the discordant, dissatisfied elements in society; the Anarchist naturally turns to that party, and the Socialist and Communist also naturally turn to it. No one is far-sighted enough to properly describe what would be the condition of society if all the powers and functions of this great government were given into their hands. It certainly would produce a revolution in our government through the ordinary forms of law, which would leave not one of the principles established by our fathers, and confirmed again and again through the laws of Congress and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

If we believe, then, that this government is the best the world has ever known thus far; if we believe that our liberties, lives, and property are safe under it, we must of necessity, laying aside all partisanship, give our support to the candidate who by his life and public acts, and by the declarations of his party, which he has adopted, gives us an absolute guarantee that in his hands and under his administration the honor and integrity of the country will be safe, and that the rights and liberties of our private citizens will be maintained.

WARNER MILLER.

II.

THERE are many reasons why Mr. Bryan should be elected, and why the Democratic platform should be enforced as the policy of this government. His election would mean a complete change in the legislation and administration of affairs. The policies of the government would be taken from the old ruts and re-established upon pure Democratic lines. It would mean the displacement of the classes who have heretofore controlled legislation and the establishment of the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

It is charged that the Democratic platform is dishonest; that the aims and purposes of the party that proclaimed this platform and nominated the candidates upon it are dishonest and revolutionary. But, in reviewing the political situation and the condition of the two parties, the people may judge as to the facts relative to the matter of dishonesty and revolution. On the

one hand, it was gravely charged and asserted by a distinguished United States Senator, Mr. Chandler, that the manager of Mr. McKinley, Mark Hanna, had extorted, or endeavored to extort, from certain classes of our people, a quarter of a million of dollars, to be expended as a fund to secure the nomination of Mr. McKinley at St. Louis. That grave complaints were made by the friends of other Republican candidates for the presidential nomination against Mr. Hanna, on the same ground, is a matter of political history that cannot be disputed. And since the nomination of Mr. McKinley, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Hanna, has proclaimed his committees appointed for the purpose of raising a campaign fund to secure the election of the Republican nominee. The men in New York who constitute this campaign fund committee represent an aggregate wealth of over $500,000,000. The men in Chicago representing this campaign committee, or the committee to raise funds for the campaign, represent an aggregate wealth of over $100,000,000. Among the persons designated as members of this committee may be found men known to be the heads of trusts, combines, and monopolies, and who have amassed enormous wealth by the advantages they have gained in legislation, not only in the federal government, but in the various State governments and municipalities in which they are located.

As a further evidence of the classes who are behind and giving force and effect to the Republican campaign, it may be stated that at the Madison Square Garden meeting, the other night, at which Mr. Bourke Cockran spoke, there were vice-presidents on the platform with the speaker claiming to be Democrats, but who were cheering all the while for Mr. McKinley, who are publicly known to be at the head of many trusts and combinations against which Congress has fulminated its laws, and which laws have heretofore been a dead letter upon the statute books.

Who are the parties leading the Democracy in this campaign? The public will not fail to note the fact that some of the men who have bolted the Chicago platform and the nominees are notoriously the beneficiaries of trusts, including the Standard Oil Trust, and many others of less importance that may be named. Indeed, the Chicago platform and nominees are a standing menace to combinations, to monopolies, and the favored few

who have enriched themselves at the expense of the masses of the American people. On the platform with Mr. Cockran, and on the committee to raise funds for McKinley, may be noted the men and the syndicates, and their sympathizers, who in one bond issue alone robbed the people of this country of over $10,000,000. And on these committees to raise campaign funds may be noted the men who have taken control of the beef market of this country and dominate the prices to be paid to producers of cattle, as well as to the consumers of beef—the men who have sturdily resisted the demands of labor for fair wages, and who have used all their power to crush labor organizations and to degrade the common people of this country.

That the Republican party represents all the trusts, combinations, and other systems of class legislation and robbery that have existed in this country for a quarter of a century is a matter of political history that no man can deny. When we see the men who are the beneficiaries of class legislation and monopoly, without regard to party, whether Democrats or Republicans—the men who have heretofore claimed to be Democrats—all combining to fight the Democratic platform and the Democratic nominees, it is an object lesson that the American people will not fail to observe and to be governed by. Therefore, as I stated in the beginning, the election of Mr. Bryan would mean the displacement of these favored classes, their dethronement from control and domination of public affairs, and the re-establishment of our government upon the principles of Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln, as a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," instead of, as it has existed in recent years, a government of the classes, by the classes, and for the classes. The idea of the beneficiaries of the bond issues for the past few years, who have squeezed the government and robbed the people of millions of dollars, setting themselves up as tutors and exemplars of honesty, in politics or anything else, is a spectacle for gods and men. And yet it was to this class and this element that the Hon. Bourke Cockran, in his celebrated speech at Madison Square Garden, in pretended answer to Mr. Bryan, appealed, because they constituted his audience in the main, and were the promoters of his enterprise.

The American people are beginning to understand that this movement for the election of Mr. Bryan, on the principles of

the Chicago platform, means the restoration of this government to the hands of the plain people of this country; and hence the war now being made upon this movement by the beneficiaries of class legislation. It is true that the currency question is the dominant issue in this campaign. But it is also true that, aside from this question, the people believe that the election of Mr. Bryan means more than simply the restoration of silver, or the reformation of our currency. It means a complete, radical, and absolute change in the policies of administration, as I have stated.

What would be accomplished by the election of Mr. McKinley? Merely the continuation of existing conditions which have prevailed for many years past under Republican rule, as well as under the policies of the present administration. All parties insist that our present financial condition is deplorable; all admit that the present condition of our country is unsatisfactory to the people. They insist that there should be a change, a radical change, in the present depressed condition of our industrial population. Should Mr. McKinley be elected, he is pledged by the St. Louis platform to maintain the single gold standard. The policy of the Republican party is boldly declared to be for the maintenance of the single gold standard, at all hazards. How is this standard to be maintained? We know that during Mr. Cleveland's administration, in order to carry out the policy inaugurated by the Republican party, and maintained by the present administration, upon the financial question, there has been saddled upon the people of this country a bonded debt of $262,000,000. We are constantly driven to the necessity of borrowing money from Europe, in order to maintain for us the same monetary policy as prevails in Europe. Will Mr. McKinley continue the issue of bonds; and if not, what will be his policy upon this subject? It is true that, pending the campaign, the representatives of the bond syndicates of Europe and this country, whether they call themselves Democrats or Republicans, for political purposes, have ceased their raids upon the Treasury, and now pretend to be engaged in the patriotic work of maintaining the gold reserve so as to prevent the exporting of gold to Europe. But no one doubts that, like Bob Acres's courage, this "patriotism" will "ooze out" the moment Mr. McKinley is elected, and their raids upon the Treasury gold will be renewed

with great vigor in the fall. What will Mr. McKinley do to procure the gold to meet these demands? His party has denounced the administration of Mr. Cleveland for the issuance of bonds, and especially because they declared that the policy of his administration had been such as to prevent revenues from getting into the Federal Treasury, to meet the demands of these gold raiders in Europe and the United States. The American people want to know, and it is an interesting question to propound to Mr. McKinley and the Republican party: How are you going to procure the gold to meet what the gold gamblers of this country declare to be "gold demands"—that is, our greenbacks and Treasury notes? It will not do to answer this question, as it has been attempted to be answered by some of the Republicans, that taxes will be raised to such a point as to secure a surplus fund in the Treasury to meet these demands. Our present tariff is within the lines of protection. If it is raised higher, it will probably exclude revenue instead of raising revenue. Our Republican friends will hardly go before the country insisting that they will put the tariff on a purely revenue basis, in order to secure greater revenue to the federal Treasury; and unless they do that, there is no possibility of any tariff legislation increasing our revenues.

But, aside from the question as to whether our taxes are to be increased or not, another matter to be considered is: In what sort of funds or money shall taxes be paid? We have no taxes to-day paid in gold, and gold only. Our customs' taxes may be paid in silver dollars, or silver certificates, and are, under the ruling of the Treasury department, payable in Treasury notes and greenbacks. Our internal revenue taxes may be paid in any forms of our money or currency; so that, as a matter of fact, there is no possibility of exacting from the taxpayers a single dollar in gold to be put into the Federal Treasury under our present system of taxation. No gold can be procured, by way of taxation, to meet the "gold demands," unless taxes are made payable specifically in gold and gold alone. Do our Republican friends intend to resort to such a drastic mode of taxation as this? If not, will they tell us how they propose to procure the gold, by way of taxation, to maintain the gold reserve? There is but one other way in which to maintain the reserve, and that is the method followed by Mr. Cleveland's administration—to wit, the sale of bonds from time to time for gold. But this

system the American people has condemned. There is another way by which it has been proposed to maintain the gold standard, that is to say, by the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes, amounting to somewhere near $500,000,000. But even this would probably fail, and the next demand would be to retire all full legal-tender silver money, and to make gold, and gold only, the sole legal tender in this country, and bank notes the only currency to supplement gold.

Mr. Cleveland insisted that the treasury notes and greenbacks should be refunded into bonds, or the bonds sold for the purpose of redeeming and cancelling these paper issues, but the Congress of the United States refused to conform to these recommendations. Will the Republican party undertake to retire Treasury notes and greenbacks, and thus take from circulation what Mr. Sherman and Mr. Carlisle have both denominated "gold demands"? The natural way to maintain the gold reserve would be the retirement of all paper issues redeemable in gold, for this would so contract the currency of this country as to reduce prices below the level of prices of the world, and thus induce a flow of gold to this country to buy property and commodities, because they could be bought cheaper here than elsewhere. In other words, by still lowering our prices, we could make gold more valuable here than elsewhere. The difficulty of entering upon such a policy, however, is that the American people would rebel against it. They would not long maintain in power a political party that had entered upon so drastic a course. So that we can see no relief whatever to come to the people of this country by the election of Mr. McKinley.

But, even if the Republican party should undertake to carry out any of the policies indicated, it would be powerless to do so. Mr. McKinley's election would not mean that he could secure the passage of any tariff bill, nor could he secure any legislation upon the currency question, for the simple reason that the Senate, as now constituted, and as it will remain constituted, will be a barrier to any policy foreshadowed in the St. Louis platform. The country well knows that the Republican tariff bill, passed by the Republican House of Representatives in the last session of Congress, was defeated in the Senate by Republican votes; and the people know that no tariff bill, that no bill for the issue of bonds, and no bill upon the lines laid down in the St. Louis platform,

could pass the Senate during Mr. McKinley's administration if he were elected. He would be utterly helpless as President, and would simply find himself occupying the same position Mr. Cleveland has occupied during his present administration. There would be nothing left for Mr. McKinley but to pursue the policy followed by Mr. Cleveland—to wit, the issuing of bonds from time to time to procure gold with which to maintain the gold standard. And the very men who are now, for political effect, refraining from drawing gold from the Federal Treasury, in order to secure the election of Mr. McKinley, would be the first to rob the Treasury of its gold the moment it ascertained the Republicans had been victorious in the November election. Yet these are the men who denounce the Democratic platform for dishonesty.

The question then arises, Are we to have, and ought we to have, a change from the present conditions? Are the people satisfied with the hard times now in this country? Are they prepared to say that they would prefer the continuation of the present administration, or of an administration that would pursue the same policy as that of Mr. Cleveland, or do they desire a change? If they wish a change, there is but one method in which to secure it. That mode is pointed out in the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago.

We propose to base our system of finances upon the well-tried doctrine of bimetallism. We declare that our bonded debt, that the greenback and Treasury notes, and all other forms of government paper payable in coin, are payable in gold or silver, at the option of the government, and not at the option or pleasure of those holding government obligations. We insist that this government is strong enough to pursue the policy that is followed to-day by the Bank of France, which is, to pay gold or silver at the option of the Treasury and thus to bring silver into use as an aid to gold, and in this way to obviate the necessity of any further bond issues to maintain coin redemptions. And as a means of supplying our people with a currency we propose to go back to the old system that was followed by this government during eighty years of Democratic rule, with open mints to the free coinage of gold and silver, as was our policy prior to 1873. This will give us a system of currency that will be adequate in volume, and stable, as compared to all other things. This we propose to do without the aid or consent of any other nation.

We insist that this country is abundantly able to maintain a financial system of its own. The Republican party, in its St. Louis platform, confesses that bimetallism is preferable to gold monometallism, but demands the maintenance of the gold standard until international agreement can be had looking to the establishment of bimetallism throughout the world. The people of the United States have become impatient upon the question of international bimetallism. For more than twenty years the argument of international bimetallism has loomed up to thwart the hopes of the American people upon this subject. It has been interjected into every campaign and been made a stumbling block to every step looking towards the restoration of silver by the American people. They will no longer be fooled in this way. We must either establish bimetallism for ourselves or surrender the fight and content ourselves with the single gold standard for all time.

The people of the United States, while not so large in population as are France and Germany and Great Britain combined, yet constitute nearly 75,000,000 people, with productive power as great as all three of the nations named. We have a commercial power equal to theirs. And besides all this, we are a nation comparatively new, with an immense territory yet to be developed, and with enterprises to be entered upon far exceeding the resources of all Europe combined.

In other words, if the nations of Europe combined could maintain a bimetallic standard, the United States can do so alone ; for our commercial power and our needs for money are as great as those of the principal countries of Europe combined. The demands of this country for silver would equal or exceed the demands for silver as money, by France, England, and Germany together ; and yet in the face of this fact, well known by sensible people, the advocates of the single gold standard insist that under the free coinage of silver favored by the Chicago platform, the demand for silver by the people of this country would not cause its value to appreciate, as compared with gold. No man in his senses but can see that should our government cease its great demand for gold, which now exists under the single gold standard, and throw its power upon the side of silver, making its demand for silver instead of gold, such a condition would inevitably lower the value of gold and appreciate that of

silver, thus bringing the two metals to practical parity in this country, and throughout the world. Whatever value we should give to silver at our mints, that metal would obtain the world over. No matter where silver might be, it would there command the same price it would have in the United States, less the cost of transportation; for no man would take less for his silver, anywhere in the world, than he could procure for it at our mints. And hence, instead of silver coming here to be coined, as is insisted by the advocates of the single gold standard, silver would perform monetary duty throughout the world, at the value fixed upon it by our mints. It would remain in the various countries where needed, and pass at the monetary value fixed in the United States.

Under a system of bimetallism there would be no difficulty whatever of maintaining all forms of our currency at par with coin. There would be no necessity for contracting our currency, or destroying the greenbacks or Treasury notes. They would circulate everywhere as the representatives of coin, and of equal value with coin.

Under such a system of currency there would be a revival of business throughout the land, that would cause money to flow into our Treasury in amounts sufficient to meet all demands. Under our system of taxation on consumption, taxation may decrease as consumption decreases under stress of hard times and scarcity of work. A revival of business activities would necessarily largely increase consumption, and this increased consumption would swell the money flowing into the Treasury.

There would be no scramble for gold, for silver would answer all the purposes of gold.

The stock of silver coin and bullion now in the Treasury, together with the coin that would come into the Treasury by way of taxation, would at all times be sufficient to meet our coin obligations, thus obviating the necessity for continued sales of bonds for resumption purposes.

R. P. BLAND.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

STAGE SCENERY AND THE VITASCOPE.

WHEN Mr. Edison first made his kinetoscope, and long before it was put generally on public exhibition, he foretold that he would enlarge the effects produced by it, and give life-sized pictures of people, all sorts of animals and mechanisms or other objects in action, with every detail of their movement and every expression of their faces. These "living pictures" in a new sense—these illuminated shadows that have all the naturalness—and a nearly perfect semblance, of reality—could, he said, be used in conjunction with the phonograph and be substituted for real persons and dialogue spoken by them in plays upon the stage.

The development of the vitascope has already in part fulfilled this prediction. Some of us who have seen the results of its operation, and have been stirred to wonder and admiration by its life-like reproductions, have already begun to speculate as to still greater possibilities in store for it. The vitascope is an elaborate machine, on a large scale, which, by means of electric power and light, magnifies and throws upon a screen images previously photographed by the kinetoscope apparatus on a long and narrow sensitized gelatine film, like a ribbon. These small negatives on the gelatine ribbon are made at the rate of from forty-six to fifty per second, while the ribbon is running swiftly along, driven by electricity, behind a photographic lens in the kinetoscope. The lens has a shutter, which opens just long enough to admit one impression of the moving object; then closes, while the ribbon passes on for the space of perhaps a quarter of an inch, and opens again to receive another impression.

Every one of the impressions thus received becomes a perfect and sharply outlined photographic negative, stamped on the ribbon in a small fraction of a second, allowing for the pauses when the automatic shutter is closed and no impression at all is being recorded. In one minute about 3,000 of these negatives are made.

In the kinetoscope this ribbon afterward, for the purpose of bringing together in the spectator's eye the blended images of all the negatives, and so creating for him the total impression of a moving form, is revolved behind a lens at a little higher speed than when the photographs were taken upon it. A small electric light placed under or behind it gives illumination to the figures or other objects on the ribbon, and so makes them visible to the spectator.

The vitascope, a far more complicated and powerful structure, takes this same ribbon which has been prepared by the kinetoscope, and coils it up on a disc at the top of the machine, from which it is passed over a system

of wheels and through a narrow, upright clamp-like contrivance that brings it down to a strong magnifying lens, behind which there is an electric burner of high capacity. The light from this carbon burner blazes fiercely through the translucent ribbon, and projects the images on the negatives there, blended, to a distant screen, with great clearness, for the benefit of the audience. The clamp device just mentioned regulates the gliding or the pausing of the gelatine ribbon, and is further assisted by an automatic hammer below it, which recedes and advances fifty times in a second, keeping the ribbon flat and straight as it passes down before the magnifying lens.

In fifty feet of the photographic gelatine film or ribbon there are some 750 negatives. It takes about forty seconds to run fifty feet of this ribbon through the machine and by the magnifiying lens. Photographic ribbons are now made for the vitascope which are 1,000 feet in length and contain the pictures of three different subjects. In this way, one subject may be shown on the screen, and, after a very slight pause during which the light is intercepted by an automatic swinging shutter, the next subject can be exhibited without stopping to adjust a new gelatine ribbon.

The cinematograph, contrived by Lumière, of Paris, which has also been displayed recently in New York, gives much the same results as the Edison vitascope ; but, if I am rightly informed, it is worked on the kinetoscope plan. The pictures are thrown out through a shutter lens, and the continuity of impression is liable to be somewhat broken.

The point that interests us most at present, however, is whether the vitascope can be utilized to replace, in the future, the ordinary stage scenery to which we have now—through many generations of experience and much artistic work—become accustomed. No serious attempt has so far, I believe, been made to use the phonograph in direct coöperation with vitascopes. This may be partly for the reason that no entirely satisfactory transmitter has yet been made for sending out the recorded phonograph speech in a large auditorium. Yet it seems almost inevitable that, in time, a successful combination of the two instruments will be made, so that a play may be given with the actors, the voices, and surroundings created wholly by mechanical means and run by electric motor, supervised by two or three trained assistants. That would be an exhibition copying the drama enacted by living beings, and although somewhat apart from it, yet very useful, no doubt, in private houses, or in places where a theatre and company of actors were lacking. Already, in the vitascope and cinematograph exhibitions, we notice that where breakers are represented, dashing on the seashore, or a charge of cavalry afield, the illusion is heightened by an accompaniment of appropriate rushing and tramping noises behind the scene, or martial music from the orchestra.

But can the vitascope be so used as to make painted scenery unnecessary in plays performed by flesh and blood actors ; or is it likely, at any rate, to replace that to some extent and to become a valuable adjunct in certain particulars of scenic effect upon the stage? It may not for a long time hence be adequate for producing all the illusion needed in placing a scene upon the stage ; and as its chief attractiveness is in its representing *motion*, it alone would hardly be called upon to supply the various parts of a stage-setting that are without motion. There seems to be little doubt, however, that the vitascope may soon take an important position in heightening theatrical verisimilitude.

Where, for instance, it is desired to show a waterfall in the background, or a sea-shore with waves rolling in on the beach, or a storm at sea, there can be no question that the vitascope would represent these things, taken absolutely from life, with a thousand-fold more effectiveness and pleasure to the audience than anything in the line of most skilful stage device with which we are now acquainted. Marine views, with sailing vessels, steam yachts, and boats in motion—the dimpling and rippling of the water—and people embarking or disembarking, could be rendered with delicious and genuine vividness. Flags fluttering in the wind; canvas awnings shaking over house-windows; passing clouds, mist, and sunshine in the sky, and puffs of dust in the air could all be conveyed to us without a flaw. A crowd in a background of street; a busy scene in the markets; the coming and going of vehicles—all these could be shown to perfection. It is easy to see, further, that spectacular effects of distant multitudes, of armies advancing, battling, and retreating could be placed before us as nothing else can place them now. Sir Henry Irving achieves a great stage point with his masqueraders trooping through the scene, in his production of "The Merchant of Venice." Imagine how much more brilliant and veracious the effect might be with vitascope figures for auxiliaries!

Then, too, in any out-door scene—in "As You Like It," for example, or "King Lear" or "Macbeth"—would it not be a great enhancement to have the tree-boughs waving, and sunlight and shadow flickering precisely as in nature?

In the matter of panoramic scenery, furthermore, where it is desired to give the impression that the actors are passing through a long stretch of landscape, either on foot or in boats, the vitascope offers facilities which the next generation will probably enjoy to the full.

Certain practical difficulties will present themselves to the inquiring mind, in considering this subject.

If illuminated vitascope backgrounds are to be used on the stage, how shall we make the actors and their surroundings harmonize? At present, the vitascope picture is thrown from the front of the theatre on to the screen which takes the place of the ordinary "flat" of painted canvas at the back of the stage. If this method were continued the actors would necessarily cast grotesque and disconcerting shadows on the vitascope scenery behind them, up the stage. This difficulty can be obviated by placing the vitascope *behind* the screen on the stage; so that there would be no possibility of its radiance causing shadows from the figures of the living actors in front of the screen. Thin, white, transparent muslin should be used for the screen. The only serious obstacle to using the vitascope reproductions in this way from the rear is the fact that on the stages of some theatres there is not room enough behind the scene for the proper working and effect of this machine.

Another important consideration is that of securing proper colors in vitascope scenery. Entirely satisfactory color effects are now secured in the brilliant reproductions, given at a well-known theatre in New York, of skirt and serpentine dances; but this is accomplished only through the careful hand-painting of every separate negative in the series of thousands that are whirled past the magnifying lens. The process, as may easily be conceived, is laborious and costly; and the colors must then be fixed upon all the tiny negatives of the gelatine ribbon with powerful chemicals, in order to prevent their fading under the intense heat of the carbon burner, to which

they are exposed. It does not seem impossible that, for the obtaining of simpler color effects than these, cheaper devices which yet would be adequate may be contrived.

Mr. Edison is now occupied with a much larger form of vitascope—or, as he prefers to call it, kinetoscope—which will make negatives containing as many as *six hundred* moving human figures or other figures in motion; so that immense spectacles may be displayed by it, filling the whole space of the "flat" scene of a theatre. An entire pantomime may thus be reproduced, or a yacht race, a sham battle, a parade, or a horse race with a large part of the onlookers in the grand-stand.

As yet, vitascope exhibitions are confined to episodes lasting from two to five minutes; though, of course, these can be lengthened by running the same or duplicate photographic series past the lens several times in succession. For a waterfall effect or that of a river scene or a wind-stirred forest, this plan of repetition could be advantageously used. Moreover, a thousand-foot ribbon will run for about thirteen minutes; and if this were all devoted to one subject, no repetition would be necessary. Thirteen minutes, in a play, is a long stretch of time.

It may be added here that the cost of actually operating the vitascope is very small. With regard to possible panoramic effects on the stage, also, it is interesting to observe that some of Mr. Edison's assistants, under his direction, have lately made experiments in taking kinetoscopic negatives for use in the vitascope, with a kinetoscope mounted on a revolving platform, so that while the instrument itself remains in the one spot it takes in a large sweep of scenery, which is afterwards brought before us in the vitascope as though it were a landscape that we were viewing while we moved by. I believe that it is intended also to prepare negative ribbons with instruments placed on railroad trains or boats to take in continuous views of the scenery visible from these.

One practical difficulty has been met with, which cannot at present be overcome in all cases, viz., the jarring of the cabinet in which the kinetoscopic recording camera is set. The construction and action of the machine are so fine and so sensitive that slight vibrations interfere with the running of the gelatine ribbon on a line equally true at each movement. This, I understand, is the cause of that slight oscillation or upward and downward jolting of the picture when it comes before us on the screen. The cabinet has to be carried around and set down in all sorts of places; not always with a steady foundation available. In some cases, where conditions have been favorable, the reproduced blended picture is perfectly steady; in others it joggles, as though shaken in its frame. Frequently, too, small flecks or points of sharp white light appear in the picture, with a slightly dazzling effect. These are due to flying motes or particles in the air, which become fixed on the film or ribbon during the process of coating it. No remedy for this minor defect has yet been found. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that, after further effort, all the small drawbacks of the present will be overcome.

Mr. D. Macfarlan Moore, whose display of the vacuum tube electric light in New York, last winter, drew great attention from scientific men and admiration from the public, looks upon the projection of pictures for stage scenery as entirely practicable. The vacuum tube, he says, fitted to give light of almost any tint, would be an ideal means of stage illumination or decoration. But one of the most marvellous applications of vacuum tubes

to stage effects, he thinks, will be by the use of induction. Actors may be provided with light glass wands of any conceivable shape, which, by varying the vacuum can be made to radiate light of any desired color; neither the wands nor the actors being connected to anything electrical, since the induction screen influencing the wands or tubes would be placed above the stage and out of sight. Here is another possible solution of the color problem in the "projected" scenery of the theatre of the future.

GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE OPIUM WAR.

THE article by Mr. David A. Wells which appeared in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for June has for its expressed object to repel an unjust charge commonly brought against the policy of England by American writers. It may seem ungracious on the part of an Englishman to repudiate the plea which he makes in respect of the opium war; but that portion of his article is, in effect, an attack upon the position taken up by those British citizens who have, during the past half century, spent time and money in seeking to reverse the policy of their own government with regard to the opium traffic—not without many encouragements, and some notable victories. As one of those thus assailed, I trust that I may be allowed to controvert some of the statements contained in the article, which is very far indeed from being, as the writer claims, "a summary of the indisputable facts."

The "complete evidence" which Mr. Wells states to have only recently become popularly accessible to refute the charge against the British government of forcing opium upon China, is manifestly that contained in the appendices to the Report of the Royal Commission on Opium, presented to our Parliament last year. These papers, however, disclosed no new facts of any importance with regard to the opium war: they do but summarize the despatches presented to Parliament at the time, and already used by all competent historians, such as the American Dr. Wells Williams, in his *Middle Kingdom*, and Justin McCarthy, in his *History of Our Own Times*. They have also been fully referred to by the authors of the two prize essays which have become standard monographs on the opium question, the Rev. Storrs Turner, in his *British Opium Policy*, and Mr. J. Spencer Hill, in *The Indo-Chinese Opium Trade*.

To say that the opium war was instituted "in order to force" China to take opium may perhaps be taken to imply that such was the express intention of the statesmen responsible for it, and is therefore a mode of statement which is better avoided. But it is a good old rule of the common law that a man is taken to intend the consequences which he must have known were likely to result, and which have in fact resulted, from his action. For such consequences he is criminally responsible, and the law does not stop to enquire into his motives. Just in this way the government of Lord Melbourne, and the British Parliament, which, by a narrow majority, approved its proceedings, must be held guilty of having forced opium upon China.

The statement that "previous to the inception of the so-called opium war between England and China (*i. e.*, in 1840) opium was cultivated in no less than ten of the provinces of China," contains an important error of date. It is manifestly taken from a paper laid before the Opium Commission by the late Sir Thomas Wade, formerly British Minister in China, and stated by

him to have been compiled from information furnished by a respectable young Chinese merchant at Canton. But the date of that paper is 1847, and it contains the following statement with regard to one of these provinces: "The crop in Kwang Tung was said to be in 1847 from 8,000 to 10,000 piculs, so vastly has the quantity produced increased *since Commissioner Lin's proceedings in* 1839," the proceedings which led to the war. Sir Thomas Wade, in his evidence, quoted from the Chinese state papers on the opium question shortly before the war a declaration made by the censors that the poppy "was then grown in four or five provinces." It is plain that this was regarded as a new development of the evil, arising out of the taste that had been created by imported opium; for the opium crave, when once formed, is well known to be the most imperious of all appetites. The result of the war of 1840 was to defeat the honest and determined attempt of the imperial government of China to stamp out the traffic, and this naturally led to an increase in the home growth of the poppy.

After our second war with China, which induced the Chinese government reluctantly to submit to the legalization of the traffic by placing opium in the tariff of imports, there was a further and yet more rapid increase. According to the testimony of missionaries who have lived long in China, the growth of the poppy has enormously developed since they first went to that country, and consular reports are to the same effect. The Rev. Dr. Griffith John, who has been laboring in China more than forty years, in a letter I received from him a few years ago, writes: "We (the British people) are responsible, not only for supplying the Chinese with an enormous quantity of poison from India, but also for setting agoing its wide-spread cultivation in China. . . . The opium war gave an impulse to the cultivation, and, since the legalization of the traffic, the poppy, like a noxious weed, has been running over the whole land."

Mr. Wells is altogether in error when he says that before the war of 1840 the importation of opium "was permitted and regularly taxed the same as any other imports." The trade had been prohibited in China for more than a century before the war.* That there was much corruption among the mandarins, and that they had established a tariff of hush money, is notorious; if this is all that Mr. Wells means, he has certainly used very misleading terminology. There was no analogy between this contraband trade and the lawful commerce carried on at Canton in other goods, under regulations sanctioned by the Chinese government. So far from opium being "imported into China by the East India Company . . . without any inhibition," the company had long found it necessary, in order to preserve their liberty of trading in China, rigorously to exclude opium from their own ships: and the trade was carried on by outside merchants, whom they licensed, and to whom they sold the drug at Calcutta, but for whose dealings they nevertheless told the Chinese authorities they had no responsibility.

It is quite true that, on the question of intercourse, China made preposterous claims to treat all foreign powers as inferiors. But nothing is more clear than the fact that it was not these claims, but the seizure of contraband opium, which was the direct cause of the war. This was expressly stated to have been the case by Sir Henry Pottinger, the British plenipotentiary who negotiated, in 1842, the Treaty of Nanking.

* See Dr. Edkins' *Historical Sketch*, reprinted in the First Report of the Royal Commission, p. 156, par. 27.

With regard to the attempt to execute a Chinaman in front of the foreign factories, which Mr. Wells assumes to have been "for the purpose of deliberate insult to foreigners," he has omitted to mention that the man had been convicted of selling opium. The object of the Chinese authorities obviously was to impress upon the foreign merchants their determination no longer to permit their salutary laws against opium smuggling to be set at defiance, even by their own subjects. But every warning was lost upon the traders, and the Chinese were thus at length led to take the strong measures which brought on the war.

Impartial and unprejudiced readers of the contemporary despatches will agree with the judgment pronounced at the time by Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, that the opium war was "a national sin of the greatest possible magnitude." Mr. Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons, made during the debate on the war, has been ratified as the judgment of history, and may well be set off against the opinion of Mr. Quincy Adams, as quoted by Mr. Wells:

"A war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know, and I have not read of. The right honorable gentlemen opposite spoke of the British flag waving in glory at Canton. That flag is hoisted to protect an infamous contraband traffic; and if it were never hoisted except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from its sight with horror. Although the Chinese were undoubtedly guilty of much absurd phraseology, of no little ostentatious pride, and of some excess, justice, in my opinion, is with them; and whilst they, the pagans, the semi-civilized barbarians, have it on their side, we, the enlightened Christians, are pursuing objects at variance both with justice and with religion."

The United States have freed themselves from all complicity with the opium traffic by their treaty with China, which absolutely forbids American citizens to import opium into that country. Those who, in the United Kingdom, are striving to induce their native land to follow this good example, and thus do all that can now be done to wipe out the crime of the past, whilst getting rid of the national disgrace that attends her continued participation in the evil traffic, may surely count upon the sympathy and support of all right-minded citizens of the American Republic.

JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER,
Hon. Sec. Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade.

ROMAN AND ANGLO-SAXON CRIMINAL JURISPRUDENCE.

The following correspondence refers to a point touched upon by the Mexican Minister in his article on "Criminal Jurisprudence, Roman and Anglo-Saxon," in the July number of the REVIEW.

I.

SENOR DON MATIAS ROMERO,
Minister of the Republic of Mexico, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with deep interest your valuable article in the July number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, contrasting the systems of criminal jurisprudence in force in your own country and in this: and I am happy to say that I have gained from it much information which I had not before possessed, and of which very, very few of our American lawyers, and publicists even, have any adequate knowledge, and I desire, therefore, to sincerely thank you.

May I, however, take the liberty of correcting a misstatement contained in the paragraph commencing at the bottom of page 88. It would seem that you regard the power of a court of equity to restrain the enforcement of a common-law judgment as equivalent to the power of a court of appeal. As a matter of fact, it is not so. A court of equity has no power whatever, under our system of jurisprudence, to interfere where an appeal would be the proper remedy. But where there has been fraud, or where it appears that judgment has been entered when, in fact, no summons has been served on defendant, although the record recites that summons has been served, a court of equity may act, provided the question could not have been raised in the common-law suit, by reason of want of knowledge on the part of the defendant until after the expiration of the term of court, or some similar reason. In addition, the defendant who seeks the aid of a court of equity in such case must show that the plaintiff had no cause of action; but, if an appeal can be taken, an appeal must be taken, or defendant cannot complain.

The error into which you have inadvertently fallen is, perhaps, a natural one, and does not detract in the least from the value of your article, for which I again express my appreciation.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant.

EDWIN I. FELSENTHAL.

II.

MR. EDWIN I. FELSENTHAL,

DEAR SIR: In answer to your kind and appreciative note concerning my article in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, contrasting the criminal systems of the Roman and the English law, I have to say that I am entirely aware that under the English or Anglo-American system of jurisprudence, there is technically no appeal from the courts of common law to the courts of equity, but that the concurrent jurisdiction of courts of common law and equity and the power of courts of equity in many cases to annul or restrain the judgments of courts of law had the practical effect of an appeal from the latter to the former. Probably I did not use the term "appeal" in the strict technical sense which it has in your jurisprudence, but rather in the common sense. However, your great commentator, Sir Edward Coke, in his famous controversy with Lord Bacon concerning the jurisdiction of equity, would seem to have regarded the exercise of the jurisdiction assumed by equity as an attempt to give an appeal to the courts of chancery from the courts of common law.

Thanking you for the kind expressions concerning my article contained in your letter. I am, very truly yours,

M. ROMERO.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXIX.

OCTOBER, 1896.

THE SAFE PATHWAY OF EXPERIENCE.

BY THE HON. T. B. REED.

PRACTICAL and sensible politics are at all times very unsatisfactory to the voter. He has always to vote for many things about which he is indifferent and for some things which are quite repugnant, in order to obtain the few things which he vehemently desires. It has always been so and always will be so; for the difficulty arises out of the nature of things. There are in this country at least ten millions of voters, each one of whom in the eye of the law is as much entitled to have his way as any other. But each one of these ten million sovereigns has a marked individuality, and each one a turn of mind peculiarly his own. Then there are throughout the mass various degrees of intelligence and information, as well as different degrees of patriotism and good sense. To any one who takes the trouble to think it must be plainly apparent that all possibility of action must depend upon compromise. For practical purposes we must so modify what we really want by a comparison of views, and by a mutual yielding, and by such a softening of our claims as will commend the result to the majority of voters.

From the very nature of things it must follow that we vote the way which, on the whole, we think wisest, and not often for what we entirely approve of. Only two alternatives are ever really presented, and neither one entirely satisfies our judgment;

Copyright, 1896, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

and yet the course we take must, on the whole, satisfy our sense of public duty.

Sometimes it seems a duty to go with one party, not because we are satisfied with its declarations, but because on the whole we trust in its composition and believe from its make-up that it will not do the bad things which have been worked into its platform or inserted in its public declarations.

Sometimes we leave the party temporarily, though its general scope is ours, because in the particular instance we are sure the declarations are wrong and that the men who have taken temporary possession of the party are wrong also.

Perhaps there was never in the history of this country a more conspicuous case of the bad conditions I have described than has been created by the attitude and action of the Democratic party at Chicago. Both things have happened which were to be deprecated. The declarations are wrong, unfortunate, and unhappy; and the men placed in charge are sure to carry out all that is bad in the declarations, and to supplement this badness by ill action peculiarly their own. Hence it is that so many of the Democratic party are leaving it temporarily, and hence it is that those who are leaving it are those who have been most conspicuous as guides and leaders. Let us see what has led to this condition of affairs; for events grow out of each other, and the present is the result of the immediate past, just as the future will be the result of the present.

In 1892 we had an election which was a complete overturn, placing in power a party which had been out of power thirty-two years. True, we had had a Democratic President from 1885 to 1889, but his party was not in power, and hence all that could be done by his administration was to keep things as they were. But in 1893 the party came into power with the Executive and with the Legislature all its own, and hence had to take positive action. Thereupon grave and serious mistakes were made. This is not said upon partisan authority. My authority for saying that grave mistakes were made is the voice of the people in three elections—one in 1893 in various States, one in 1894 throughout the nation, and again one in all the States in 1895.

I will not cite the testimony of the President, for that is too severe to use in a conciliatory campaign like this. That the Democratic party, coming into power after thirty years of exclusion,

should blunder was entirely in accord with the principles of human nature. A party long in the minority simply gathers the opposition people, not because they agree in principle, but because they agree in opposition. Each member of such a party takes his position for his own peculiar reason; one, because he is a free trader; another, because he is a protectionist, like Samuel J. Randall, in favor of protection provided it can be accomplished incidentally and not directly; another, because he does not like the bank system; and still another, because he is for free silver at any price; and so on for numberless reasons. While these people are out of power merely criticising, they all seem united, and they are. They are united in opposition to the other party and, as it turns out, in nothing else. It is when they have to act affirmatively that the discord shows itself. And what a discord there was! Nothing has been like it since the Constitution was adopted. To all the natural causes was added a new trouble. The President was not in accord with the majority of his party either on tariff or on finance. Strong in himself, he stood by his faith. The results of the action taken, for that is what, after all, we are interested in, were universally bad. Business became so unsettled that language fails to portray the distress of the country. It is not needful to go into description. It would be but a waste of paper.

Yet these results were perfectly natural. No party constituted as the Democratic party was in 1893 could have successfully met expectation in both finance and tariff, and meted out with an equal hand that justice embodied in law which would have given us peace and prosperity.

Under this condition of things, with three defeats already suffered and another staring them in the face, what were Democrats to do? What was the party to do? One patriotic course was open to them, and that was to let the final verdict be recorded and without opposition let their opponents govern the country. But that would be defeat consented to openly, which was perhaps more than human nature was equal to. The other alternative was to gather about them all the dwellers in the cave of Adullam among whom was not the essential David, and inaugurate a war of classes, with free silver as a seduction and allurement.

Free silver is a seduction and allurement. The word free has

alone a great charm for our people. We have fought the battles of freedom. Our best and bravest have laid down their lives that we might be free, and then that the friendless slave might be free also, and we are all permeated with the sentiment. I once heard a gentleman, now a distinguished Senator, who had fought to keep the slaves in slavery, round out an eloquent peroration by declaring for free trade and free men, utterly unconscious of the queer contrast between his words and actions. The American people, too, have always been ready to aid silver, for it is one of our products. We have bought it at high prices, and hold it now at low prices to further its production. We have bought and paid cash for silver to the amount of 464 millions of dollars, and what we paid 464 millions for will now, at 67 cents the ounce, bring us but 328 millions. In other words, we have lost 136 millions and more by the operation; or, as it should be stated, we have paid out 464 millions to bring the silver dollar to par, and it is now worth 53 cents, and we have sunk 136 millions and more in the attempt. Of course, any struggling industry of the United States ought to have due help, but the help ought to have some reference to all the industries of the country. Ought anything more to be done? A portion of the cargo overboard ought always to be saved, but not at the peril of the rest and of the ship's company. We could perhaps afford to spend 464 million dollars and lose 136 and more to help those who own mines; but to disarrange our whole system of currency, including the very standard, and really not rescue the silver mines after all would be carrying nationalism much too far. We have tried all the experiments we can try and have done our duty as we ought to have done by the pioneers who are opening up the great riches of the far West. We do not grudge them the losses we have made in this effort to aid them. Could we really aid the larger interests of the West itself, we would be more than glad so to do; but to undergo all the horrors of the readjustment of values in order to reach a constantly falling currency would be unwise, even beyond the Mississippi—indeed, more unwise there than anywhere in the United States.

If we could lift silver to twice its height and keep it there, we would be glad to do it, because the good of any part of the country is the good of all. But all experience shows we cannot do it. If buying nearly the whole American product seemed but to stim-

ulate the fall, will taking the balance raise it? It will not do to reply that "we believe" so and so. That may do for theology, but not for business. Things in this world go on irrespective of our beliefs. "We believe" was as freely uttered about the purchase clause of the Sherman act as it is about free coinage; and yet silver did not go to par, but, on the contrary, went steadily and ruthlessly down. The laws of nature have no mercy on theories. The very purchase so stimulated production as to help cause the fall. Silver production is not what it was years ago, before there was peace in Mexico and everywhere, and when for many causes the fluctuation was small. Now the mountains of Mexico, as well as our own, are open to our search, and the production resembles a manufacture responding to demand both in quantity and value, increasing in quantity and falling in price.

It seems very clear when we get out of the cloudy regions of "we believe" and fasten ourselves to the great facts we know, that after all the shock of readjustment of values we shall simply be on a lower basis much more unstable than we are now. How that can help us nobody on earth can tell. It may pay our debts more easily; but, compared with the loss of credit and standing, that is no blessing. The evils we can see are very clear, and the misfortunes which are to come with it will fall on the West and South more severely than anywhere else. We are an undeveloped nation. Great as we are, so great that we have seldom any cause to tell people about it, as we did in the years before everybody knew it, and while we ourselves could hardly believe our own senses; rich as we are, so rich that even our stupid blundering cannot commence our ruin; broad as our acres are, circling half the globe; great as we are, rich as we are and broad as are our acres, we are but at the beginning of the glories of the Republic, not glories of the conquest of men, but of the conquest of the elemental powers and of resources beyond limit and without stint. And yet all the riches we have, compared with the work our wealth must do, are so utterly inadequate to even the resources which are in sight that we cannot rely on them alone. And even our own riches we cannot have the use of under present conditions. The tightest lock on riches we can have in this world is distrust. No steel-guarded safe can keep money in the hands of its owners so steadfastly as uncertainty of return if once parted with. Why should a man who has

property let anybody have it unless sure of a return? What does our whole country need, the West and the South above all? Capital to be spent in development. It does seem strange, situated as we are, that we should wish to put ourselves in the very attitude which prevents the free outpouring of capital which exists unemployed here, and which will come from abroad longing to be employed. It sometimes seems that the basis of it was the masterfulness of human nature; we would much rather drive than coax. In the old days, if some of our powerful ancestors wanted to borrow money, they took the nearest wealthy man, especially if they could rouse religious prejudice also, and pulled some of his teeth by way of argument. But the world outside of Central Africa, after full trial of those methods, have discarded them. As long as we let people have property we have to let them do what they will with their own.

But will not people lend us money on a silver basis, even if it is an unstable currency? Oh! yes, after you get there; and make you pay smartly for it, too. Meantime, while you are getting there, there will be more years of worry, hesitation, and doubt, not to speak of what will happen after you get there. Have we not had enough of this already? One would think so. Going further is so often merely faring worse that we had better have a care.

There is much of resemblance between this campaign and that of 1872. Any one who remembers that year can easily recall how much uncertainty there was at the opening, how vigorous was the onslaught, and how certain a victory was promised the promiscuous multitude which assailed General Grant. Even his friends were in very grave doubt and trepidation. The assault was fierce and seemed overwhelming. But the questions began to be discussed all over the land, and at once a change began which in a fortnight seemed absolutely wonderful. It so happens in any intelligent nation that when a new question is presented its friends are very zealous, and as their voices alone are heard the outcry seems almost unanimous. But, after all, such questions are decided not by the loud voices which first fill the atmosphere, but by the sober second thought of the men whose property and happiness are to be so seriously affected by the result. So it has been in this campaign. For many years the people in favor of silver have had the floor. We were all

desirous to help them if we could safely do so. The argument for world bimetallism had many charms. But the present proposition has not been able to stand the test of discussion. It is useless to try to confound it with world bimetallism, with which it has no connection whatever. Bimetallism means the use by all the world, by countries which now use silver alone, and by countries which use gold, of gold and silver. This proposition on which the American people are to pass is not of that sort. The proposition is to go to a silver basis instead of staying on a gold basis.

It is true that Mr. Bryan says "we believe" that silver will go to par. But, speaking without the slightest disrespect, who is this Mr. Bryan that his "we believe" should be substituted for the facts of the universe, for the eternal verities? All the facts and all the experiments we have made are the other way. Have these gentlemen who "believe" been successful prophets heretefore? Let the "markets of the world," which were to make us so prosperous, answer. In a word, with the safe pathway of all experience, and especially of our own experience open before us, shall we try to blaze a new path, when we can see the edges of many of the pitfalls and morasses in which we will flounder?

Flying machines stand in the future decked with all the comforts and conveniences which imagination can furnish; but in the present state of the art, perhaps, an ordinary wagon would furnish safe transportation, to say nothing of railroads and steamboats.

There is one fact in this campaign of which particular notice ought to be taken.

This introduction of the silver question into national politics in the course adopted at Chicago has completely disorganized the Democratic party. It is natural that it should do so. The President, while at variance with the majority of his party, has had associates within the party who fully endorse his ideas and who believe with him. This is not a new thing. It was manifest that this division existed during his first term, and he and his friends made no effort to disguise their position when he was a candidate the second time. This portion of the Democratic party can have no fellowship with Mr. Bryan. What ought these people to do? Perhaps it may be thought that the writer of this article has no right to give them advice, and yet he has

given them much good advice for many years. In common with others they ought to vote for Major McKinley, because he represents some important things which coincide with their own wishes. It may be true that he represents some other notions to which they are not friendly, but we know that such is continually the case in politics for the reasons which have been already given. Such Democrats are sure that no greater misfortune can happen to the business interests of the nation than sinking to the level of the silver standard—forsaking the civilized nations and joining, so far as currency goes, those not so advanced as we ourselves are. To a man who thus believes the course must be very plain. There is one consideration which should be very powerful with such a man, and that consideration is that the larger the victory over Mr. Bryan and Mr. Watson, the more signal their defeat, the surer our reëstablishment in our own confidence and in the confidence of the world. While they may separate themselves from the Watson contingent by voting the third ticket, that will be rather a personal gratification than the full performance of a public duty. If these gentlemen say in reply this thing or that thing, this policy or that policy, in the Republican candidate does not quite suit us, the answer is obvious. If anybody waits for a candidate who perfectly suits him, he is likely not to vote until he is nominated himself; and even then, if he has good sense, he will have doubts.

It has been said by some Democrats who always seemed to me to be desiring to find some excuse for not doing their duty, that the Republican candidate nineteen years ago voted for free coinage. But nineteen years is a long time ago, and all things have changed. There were many good men who were with him then. We had not then tried the Bland experiment, nor had we bought 4,500,000 ounces of silver month by month, and watched it sink downward in spite of all our struggles to lift it up. He stands now upon the platform of his party, and, backed up as that position will be by the vote of the people, we shall have in his administration the true foundation of the stable currency so much to be desired. If that is what men want, why should they not say so in a free country?

Of course, the Republican party still believes in protection. Educational events that way have been too recent for any diminution of faith. For my part I do not believe that one-half of the

Northern Democracy differ from us in their beliefs and hopes on that subject. They have had business training, and know that business and systems of business cannot be safely changed by law except gradually and in obedience to the demands of business men. It is true that the late political contests have given rise to such a use and misuse of epithets that many a Democrat thinks he has become a free trader when he has not.

However that may be, we have certainly revenue to raise to carry on the government. When that is done, a great many of our troubles will disappear. While it is scandalous that a country as rich as ours should go into debt for its daily expenses and such action is the subject of just reprobation, the annual deficit, large though it be in itself, is not large enough in comparison with our resources to cause any trouble. But it has caused great trouble, because we have so unjustifiably muddled up the deficit with the gold redemption that confusion reigns confounded in the public mind. At the last session of Congress many votes were cast against the bond bill, a bill plainly for the advantage of the government, inasmuch as it separated the gold reserve from the deficit and left that redemption fund undisturbed to perform its proper work as the regulator of the currency. These votes were cast against it because it was said to be a shame to issue bonds in time of peace. But the shame was not there. It was in getting the country into such shape that bonds were absolutely necessary to keep the government in motion. Pulling a dripping man aboard is rather a moist and unpleasant job, but it is better than letting him drown. The real cause of blame was in letting him get overboard.

It is a great pity there was not more frankness in disclosing to the people our condition, and more frankness in locating the trouble; but men do not thrust the truth in your face very much when error is in their interest, and what with those who desired to withdraw the greenback, and those who were interested in the issuance of currency, and those who wanted free coinage of silver, and others who desired to hide the deficit, the citizens generally have had a pretty hazy idea of the condition of the currency question. When we have put our revenue on a level with our expenditures, after having settled our standard, we shall see many of our complications disappear, and we shall be on the road to the solution of the questions which remain. When the busi-

ness of the county demands more representative money we shall find a way to get it. It would be a great satisfaction even to hope that our way to get more and sounder representative money would be permanent, but one cannot be very sanguine.

The truth is that this country is much diversified, not only by hills and dales, rivers and mountains, forests and great lakes, but also by very different sets of people, and it takes a long time or a great crisis or great genius to adapt a system not only to the wants, but to the prejudices, of all this vast territory. Half a dozen men in a business chamber in New York can settle the question for themselves easily. So can the same number of intelligent men in Arkansas or California or Louisiana; but unfortunately no two settlements are alike. Nevertheless, no one who knows the mental resources of this nation will doubt that when business requires changes in our currency we shall have sense enough to make them. The first thing is to get business started at all, and the rest of our needs will in due time take care of themselves.

One word I may venture to add upon a phrase much used by the unthinking. It is quite natural for men who are tired by argument and confused by figures they do not understand to roll all responsibility off their shoulders and petulantly say: "Things cannot be worse; let us try this." Things cannot be worse! That is simply not true. We were worse off in 1878. We have put fourteen years of piled up wealth between us and that time. If we could be thrust back there we should realize it.

There is a much better bit of advice to follow. If you do not see good reason for doing a thing don't do it. Let the man who desires you to go for a new thing because it is good, prove it.

The whole matter is in small compass. Experience shows the road to prosperity. We have trodden it before. Some gentlemen tell us there is another road as yet untrodden by man, but which leads to the possession of the earth. Which road will you take—the one in sight or the one out of sight?

THOMAS B. REED.

THE CONTENTIOUSNESS OF MODERN NOVEL-WRITERS.

BY AGNES REPPLIER.

It is a serious age in which we live, and there is a painful sense of responsibility on the part of those who have assigned to themselves the task of directing their fellow creatures, not only in matters spiritual, but in all that pertains to intellectual or artistic life. That we need guidance is plain enough ; the helping hand of true and patient criticism was never more welcome than now ; but to be driven, or rather hounded, along the pleasant paths of literature by severe and self-elected teachers, all alike innocent of credentials, is not the surest way of reaching the best that has been known and thought in the world. Indeed, there is one sunny field of letters, which resembles a country fair, packed close with booths from which each eager merchant vociferates the excellence of his own wares, and decries those of his friend and neighbor. The most ardent novel-lover stands aghast before this flood of mingled eulogy and denunciation ; and he may perhaps be pardoned if, in a moment of irritation, he is fain to tell the combatants, all plucking at his sleeve, to please go on writing their fiction as well as in them lies, and he will decide for himself which of their books to read.

For it is not in the nature of man to relish a too strenuous dictatorship, especially in matters which he cannot be made to believe are of very urgent importance. When a certain critic says that American literature *must* be distinctly and unmistakably American, that it *must* be faithful to American conditions, it is difficult not to reply that there is no "must" for us of his devising. Let this critic write his stories as he thinks best, and his many admirers will read them with satisfaction ; but his con-

trol is necessarily limited to his own literary offspring. He cannot expect to whip other people's children. When Mr. Hall Caine tells the good people of Edinburgh that the novelist is his brother's keeper, that it is "evasive cowardice" for him to deny his responsibility, and that the mere fact of his having written a book proves that he feels himself something stronger than his neighbor who hasn't, we only protest, as novel-readers, against assuming any share in this spirit of acute conscientiousness. Personally, I do not believe that it is the duty of any man or woman to write a story. In nine cases out of ten, there would be greater merit in leaving it unwritten. But even granting that the author goes to work, like Mr. Caine, from the strictest sense of moral liability, there can be no corresponding obligation on our part to read the tale. We hear too much of our failure to accept and appreciate the gifts which the liberal gods are now providing for us, and it would be more modest, as well as more dignified, if those who set the feast would forbear to extol its merits.

As for the rival schools of fiction, they may as well consent to live in amity side by side. If they don't "fill one home with glee," they fill many homes with that moderate gratification which lightens a weary hour. Each has its adherents; each gives its allotted share of pleasure to people who know very well what they like, and who will never be converted by arguments into reading what they don't. It is useless to tell a man who is half way through *The House of the Wolf*, and oblivious for one blessed hour to everything in the world save the fate and fortunes of three French lads, that "the romantic novel represents a juvenile and, intellectually considered, lower stage of development than the realistic novel." He doesn't care the value of a ha'penny for stages of development. He is not reading *The House of the Wolf* by way of mental or moral discipline. He is not to be persuaded into exchanging it unfinished for *The Apprenticeship of Lemuel Barker*, because more "creative intelligence" is required to tell a story without incident—when there is, so to speak, no story to tell. What is it to him, if the book were hard or easy to write? Why should he be reminded perpetually by realists and veritists of the arduous nature of their task? He did not put them to work. The one and only thing which is of vital interest to him is the tale itself. The author's point of view, his sense of personal responsibility,

the artistic limits which he sets himself, the difficulties which he piles in his own way and heroically overcomes, the particular platform from which he addresses the universe, his stern adherence to actualities, his truthful treatment of material —all these things about which we hear so much mean nothing, and less than nothing to the reader. Give him the book, and he asks to hear no more. He judges it by some standard of his own, which may not bear the test of critical analysis, but which is more convincing to him than the recorded opinion of the writer. The wife of his bosom and his college-bred daughter are powerless to persuade him that Tourguéneff is a better novelist than Dickens. And when he stoutly resists this pressure from within, this subtle and penetrating influence of feminine culture, it is worse than useless to attack him from without with supercilious remarks anent juvenility, and the immature stage of his development.

It must be admitted that the realistic story-writers are more prone to tell us about themselves and their methods than are the heroic narrators of improbable, but none the less interesting, romances. Mr. Rider Haggard, indeed, from time to time insinuates that he, too, is trammeled by the obstinate nature of facts, and that there is a restraining and troublesome ingredient of truth mingled with his fiction. But this is surely a pleasant jest on Mr. Haggard's part. We cannot believe that he ever denied himself an incident in the entire course of his literary life. Mr. Stevenson defended with characteristic spirit those keenly imaginative and adventurous tales which have made the whole world kin, and to whose splendid inspiration we owe perhaps the added heritage of *Kidnapped* and *Treasure Island.* Mr. Lang throws down his gauntlet unhesitatingly in behalf of romance, and fights her battles with joyous and animating zeal. But Mr. Lang is not preëminently a novelist. He only drops into fiction now and then, as Mr. Wegg dropped into poetry, in the intervals of more urgent avocations. Moreover, it is seldom from these authors that we gather our minute information concerning the duties and difficulties of novel-writing. They have been too wary to betray the secrets of the craft.

Small wonder the realistic novelist finds his task a hard one. Small wonder he says so much about the difficulties which beset him. He does his duty by Mary Jane, provides her with a lover,

and laboriously strives to smooth the path of courtship. What must his feelings be when the ungrateful hussy refuses, after all his trouble, to marry the young man. Or perhaps she declines to be called Mary Ann at all, and insists that her name is Arabella, to his great annoyance and discomfiture. Lurid possibilities of revolt suggest themselves on every side, until the unhappy novel writer, notwithstanding his detestation of the "feudal ideal," as illustrated by Sir Walter Scott, must sigh occasionally for "*les Droits Seigneuriaux*," which would enable him to hang a few of his rebellious puppets, "*pour encourager les autres.*" It may be worth while, in this connection, to remind him of the absolutely arbitrary manner in which Mr. Anthony Trollope, that true master of realism, disposed of Mrs. Proudie. If ever there was a character in fiction whom we should have trusted to hold her own against her author, Mrs. Proudie was that character. No reasonable creature will for a moment pretend that an amiable, easy-going, middle-aged gentleman like Mr. Trollope was a match for the Bishop's wife, who had, in her day, routed many a stronger man. She had lived so long, too. In novel after novel she had played her vigorous part, until the right to go on living was hers by force of established usage and custom. Yet this is what happened. One morning Mr. Trollope, while writing in the Athenæum Club, enjoyed the salutary experience of hearing himself criticized, and very unfavorably criticized, by two of the club members. Among other things, they said they were tired of reading about the same people over and over again; they thought if a man had not wit enough to evolve new characters he had better give up composing novels; and they objected especially to the perpetual domination of a woman so odious as Mrs. Proudie. At this juncture, Mr. Trollope could be silent no longer. He arose, confessed his identity, admitted his sin, and promised, by way of amendment, to kill Mrs. Proudie "before the week was out;" for were not the unfinished chapters of the *Last Chronicles of Barset* lying at that moment on his table? And what is more he kept his word. He slew Mrs. Proudie, apparently quite oblivious of the fact that he was interfering unwarrantably with "nature's arrangement." I mention this incident to show that it is possible for a really determined author, who knows his rights and will have them, to overcome the resistance of the most obstinate character in his book.

For the rest it does not appear to the peace-loving reader that either the realist or the romancist has any very convincing arguments to offer in defence of his own exclusive orthodoxy. When the romancist affirms that his books lift men out of the sordid, painful realities of life into a healthier atmosphere, and make them temporarily forgetful of weariness and discontent, the realist very sensibly replies that he prefers facts, however sordid, to literary anodynes, and that it is his peculiar pleasure to grapple with things as they are. When the realist remarks in turn that nothing is easier than to write of love and war, but that it "lacks distinction," and shows a puerile and childish mind, the romancist merely chuckles, and clasps *Les Trois Mousquetaires* closer to his heart. Neither of the combatants is likely to be much affected by anything the other has to say, and we, outside the ring, can but echo Marianne Dashwood's sentiment, "This is admiration of a very particular kind." Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Lang have both distinctly recorded their debt of gratitude to Dumas. They cannot and do not claim that he is at all times an edifying writer; but many a weary hour has been brightened for them by the magic of his art, many a fretful doubt laid to rest by contact with his virile gaiety and courage. On the other hand, Mr. Boyesen has just as distinctly and just as sincerely assured us that Dumas had no charm nor spell for him, and he has added his impression that it is only those who, intellectually, never outgrow their boyhood who continue to delight in such "sensational chronicles of impossible deeds."

It is in this latter statement, which has been repeated over and over again with as many variations as a popular air, that the peculiar temper of the realist stands revealed. He is not only sure that stories of adventure are not to his liking, but he is equally sure that those who do enjoy them are his intellectual inferiors, or at least that they have not reached a mental maturity commensurate with his. He says so, with pleasing candor, whenever he has the opportunity. He is, in general, what the Ettrick Shepherd neatly terms "a bigot to his ain abeelities," and it would be hard to convince him that Dumas is none the less, in the words of Michelet, "a force of nature," because *he* is not personally stirred by that force, or because he knows a number of intelligent men who are no more affected than he is. For myself, I can but say that, being constrained once to spend two

days in Marseilles, the only thing that reconciled me to my fate was the sight of the gray Chateau d'If, standing, stern and solitary, amid the roughened waters. "Banks and tariffs, the newspaper and the caucus," may, as Emerson says, "rest on the same foundations of wonder as the town of Troy and the Temple of Delphos," but, personally, I am more susceptible to Troy, or even to the Chateau d'If, than I am to banks, of which useful institutions Marseilles contains a number, all very handsome and imposing. This is, perhaps, a matter of temperament and training, or it may be that mine is one of those "primitive natures" for whose "weak and childish imaginations," as Mr. Howells phrases it, such unrealities are a necessary stimulant. It is true that I might, if I chose, shelter myself under the generous mantle of Dr. Johnson, who was known to say that "the books we read with most pleasure are light compositions which contain a quick succession of events"; but, after all, this was but the expression of the Doctor's personal preference, and of no more weight than are the words of living critics, who share, or who don't share, his opinion.

"A good cause," says Sir Thomas Browne, "needs not to be patron'd by passion, but can sustain itself upon a temperate dispute"; and if scornful words be unneeded—and unheeded—in matters of moment, they simply run to waste when poured out over trivialities. We are asked to take everything so seriously in this unhumorous age, to talk about the novel as a "powerful educational agency," and to discuss the "profound and complex logic of reality" in a short story of mild interest and modest wit. This confuses our sense of proportion, and we grow restive under a pressure too severe. Yet who shall say that the public, big, amiable, and unconcerned, is not grateful for every readable book that strays into its path? Romance and realism, the proven and the impossible, wild stories of youthful passion and sedate studies of middle-aged spinsters, tales of New England villages, tales of Western towns, tales of Scotch hamlets, and tales of the mist-lands beyond the mountains of Africa, are all welcomed and read with avidity. The novelist, unless he be inhumanly dull, is sure of his audience, and he waxes didactic in the fullness of prosperity. When the Rev. Mr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) wrote *Beside the Bonnie Briar Bush*, the book went straight to many hearths and many hearts. It was not an epoch-making work by any

means, but its homely pathos and humor insured for it an immediate hearing and most comfortable returns. The critics united in its praise, and the publishers gave us at once to understand how many copies had been sold. Why then did Mr. Watson, to whom the gods had been so kind, lift up his voice in a few short months to say supercilious things anent all schools of fiction save his own? The world is wider than Scotland, and local coloring is not humanity's one need. It will be long ere we believe that the art of story-telling began with *A Window in Thrums*, or that *Beside the Bonnie Briar Bush* marks its final development. Let us rather remember with gratitude that Mr. Barrie, an artist too versatile to be intolerant, has recorded, in place of delicate self-analysis and self-congratulation, his sincere reverence for Scott, and Dickens, and Thackeray, and Fielding, and Smollett, "old-fashioned novelists of some repute," whose horizon is wide as the sound of our English tongue, and whose sun is not yet set.

If we cannot have peace, let us then at least have a truce, as in the old fighting days, a truce of six months or a year. It would freshen us amazingly to hear nothing for a whole year about the "soul-searching veracity" of Tolstoï," and a great many timid people might pluck up heart to read that fine novelist, who has been rendered so alarming by his admirers. For a year the romancist could write of young people who marry, and the realist of middle-aged people who don't; and, in the renewed tranquillity of content, each workman might perhaps recognize the strength of the other's position. For youth and age and marriage and celibacy are alike familiar to us all. We have no crying need to be enlightened on these subjects, though we cheerfully consent to be entertained by them. "If the public do not know what books to read," says Mr. Lang very truthfully, "it is not for lack of cheap and copious instruction." We are sated sometimes with good advice, and a little tired of being educated when we want to be amused. There are days even when we recall with mingled regret and gratitude the grey-haired unknown author of *Aucassin and Nicolette*, who wove his tale in the humble hope that it might for a few brief moments gladden the sad hearts of men.

AGNES REPPLIER.

OUR ELECTORAL SYSTEM.

BY BISHOP STEPHEN M. MERRILL, LL.D., OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

THE American citizen performs no duty with greater pleasure, or with a profounder sense of personal responsibility for good government, than that of casting his ballot for President of the United States. He properly regards it as a high privilege, and in theory, at least, looks upon it as invested with much sacredness, so that to be denied the right would be regarded as a privation or calamity not to be endured or tolerated.

There is, however, a widespread feeling in the country, if it does not amount to a positive conviction, that some of the laws regulating the method by which the choice of the people for the highest office in their gift is made, have survived the period of their usefulness, and ought to be revised and adapted to the conditions of the present time, which differ so widely from those existing when these laws were enacted. The indications are not obscure that there is a growing desire in the country to have the existing electoral plan re-examined, and possibly abandoned, so as to elect the President by a direct popular vote. There is at least enough of this feeling abroad to justify an impartial study of the subject from a non-partisan standpoint, and with a view to do ample justice to the plan as it is, as well as to ascertain whether it might be modified so as to become more republican in spirit, and to work with greater equality among the voters of the different States.

The topic is too great in itself, and too positive and far-reaching in its bearings on related questions, to be treated otherwise than tentatively or suggestively in the limits here imposed; and yet it is hoped that in outline it may be presented so as to point in the direction to which thought might be profitably turned. It

is needless to refer to the extraordinary state of things which was developed a few years ago when the count of the electoral vote was in dispute, as a reason for the revision of the laws relating thereto, since some amendments have been made, and possibly enough to prevent the recurrence of the embarrassment that then existed ; but the experiences of that crisis remind us that dangerous anbiguities may exist in legislation, and pass undiscovered for years, till some dangerous emergency brings them to light. If anything should be perfectly intelligible, and incapable of any other meaning than that intended by its authors,it is the language of the laws under which the people hold their rights and exercise their privileges as citizens of the Republic. The experiences of that crisis show, furthermore, that the people look with no little anxiety to the proceedings of Congress in making the final declaration of the result of an election, after the count has been reasonably well ascertained. Their alertness indicates the consciousness of the possibility of a mishap of some kind in any case where there is not a very decided and well-known preponderance in the electoral vote. The subject is exceedingly delicate as well as important, and certainly there is nothing in the range of national legislation which deserves cooler or profounder thought than the regulations for expressing, and then ascertaining and declaring, the people's will in the choice of the Chief Executive of the nation. All the essential features of the law on this subject should be placed beyond the uncertainty of majorities in Congress, by being incorporated in the Constitution of the United States.

In the study of this subject, the first question which presents itself is as to whether the time has come for abolishing the electoral system, and for making provision in the organic law for electing the President by popular vote, as other officers are elected. This, however, is a question of too broad significance to be answered from impulse or from partial examination. There are at least two sides to it. In our high appreciation of the popular will and of the rights of majorities there is a possibility of accepting the affirmative without giving due thought to the considerations which might be adduced by one disposed to maintain the other side. It is not impossible to make a plausible argument in favor of continuing the electoral system, with such modifications as the changed condition of the country indicates to be

wise. The people have become accustomed to the system, and about all the possibilities of evil in it have come to light and may be remedied, while no serious dissatisfaction has arisen, and no popular outcry against it is likely to be made. Its abolishment is not, therefore, in any sense to be regarded as a reform measure to eradicate abuses.

It is not to be doubted that the founders of the Republic were actuated by as high a sense of the duty of citizenship as their children possess, and their appreciation of the sacredness of the ballot and of the rights of majorities was not inferior to ours; yet in their anxiety to throw around the elective franchise all possible safeguards, and to invest it with all the sacredness that should attach to it, they saw fit to prefer the electoral system to the direct popular vote. Their motives in doing so are not in question. They undoubtedly thought it necessary to adopt some conservative method to obviate confusion and possible strife in making up results, and to prevent the undue influence of local issues and temporary excitements in determining the national policy. It may be also that they apprehended undesirable results from those personal qualities in candidates which sometimes excite the multitude to act more from impulse than from the deliberate exercise of sober reason. Before discarding their work, and substituting for it the plan of popular election, the evils of which they sought to avoid by adopting the electoral plan, we ought to place ourselves as nearly as possible in the situation of those who framed the Constitution, so as to see things as they saw them, and to feel the force of the arguments which were to them powerful and decisive.

It is necessary for us to remember that as yet, while the Constitution was being framed, and these great questions were pending, there was in reality no national government—no consolidated union—but only an assemblage of independent States, temporarily united for mutual defence and safety, under articles of confederation without the binding qualities of a national compact; and that this fact, while calculated to awaken local jealousies with regard to interests not general, was not unfavorable to the study of the scheme of election which touched every part of the country alike. There is no doubt that the question of State sovereignty, and the kindred question of State equality, entered largely into the deliberations of the constitutional convention, and had a con-

trolling influence upon the members in deciding upon the plan for choosing the President. It seemed to them both natural and necessary that in the exercise of this high function, the States, as such, should have a voice, and be represented according to their separate populations, without having their votes merged into the general mass, losing their identity as states in the final decision. In estimating the merits of the scheme adopted it is reasonable that we take account of the situation as it then was, and of the reasons for its introduction into our economy. If the controlling reasons for it were valid at that time, and if its adoption met an emergency in harmonizing conflicting claims, and in satisfying the demands of the smaller States, the wisdom of the action is vindicated, whether the same conditions still exist as reasons for the continuance of the plan, or whether they have so changed as to justify the revision of the electoral system, or its abandonment altogether. Without doubt great changes in the situation have come ; and such changes as could not have been anticipated, either as to their character or magnitude.

It was not possible for the wisest statesmen of these days to imagine the facilities which our times afford to the average voter for exercising an intelligent and independent judgment with reference to the qualifications of candidates or as to the merits of proposed policies of administration. Those in office did not then, as they do now, perform their duties in the glare of the midday sun and in the focus of millions of watchful eyes. Neither steam nor lightning aided in the diffusion of knowledge. Travel was slow and difficult, while the weekly mail and the weekly papers were the best privileges of the favored sections, leaving vast regions with the slightest opportunities for communication with the world at large. The horseback mail, the stage-coach, and the canal-boat represented the best achievements of civilization for spreading intelligence. The national conventions of the parties were not known at that time as agencies for bringing out candidates ; nor is it at all probable that the influence of such agencies for directing voters and controlling elections entered into the calculations of the times. The power of party drill was imperfectly understood and perhaps formed no part of the thought of those whose best energies were given to the study of the best plan for expressing the popular will in the choice of the Chief Magistrate. It was the

recognized right of any eligible citizen to become a candidate for this office at the instigation of his friends, or at his own option, without formal nomination by a political party; and the reasonable probability that each election would find several candidates in the field, rendering it unlikely that any one would secure a majority of the popular vote under such conditions, or even such a plurality as would make it desirable to declare him elected, was no doubt considered, and had weight in determining the conclusion reached. The force of this reasoning has not yet lost its significance.

It is not possible to do full justice to the authors of the electoral plan without considering the electoral bodies of the several States, in their true character as electoral bodies in fact, with the duties, privileges, and responsibilities of the individual electors composing them. The electors were not chosen to act as passive agents in carrying out imperative instructions, which it would be political treason to depart from under any conceivable exigency, although as representatives of the people they could not do otherwise than respect the wishes of their constituents, and secure the election of their first choice if possible; but they were not absolutely debarred from the exercise of personal judgment in the event of conditions arising not anticipated before the election. It was evidently understood that the electors chosen by popular vote were to exercise some discretion after becoming electors, as to the candidates who should finally receive their votes. The original idea appears to have been that the electors of any State might come together as a body charged with an important trust, and consider the whole situation, including the known wishes of their constituents, and the availability of candidates, and the desirability of securing for their people a second choice, if their first choice had become an impossibility, and, after proper discussion and deliberation, each elector cast his vote according to his own judgment and sense of duty. But this discretion of the individual elector is not now to be thought of as part of the scheme; for custom has laid restrictions upon the members of the body, and therefore upon the body itself, which the law did not lay upon them. The electors can do nothing more than voice the expressed will of those whose ballots place them in the body.

The original electoral plan has been changed by constitutional

amendment, and this fact suggests that other changes may be made when later experiences and observations make it plain that altered conditions render changes desirable and expedient. It was not long after the system was set in operation till the provision requiring the electors to vote only for candidates for the Presidency, making the one who received the highest vote the President, and the one who received the largest vote next to the highest the Vice-President, was unwise, as it always placed in the second office of the government a disappointed man, and the one who had been the successful candidate's strongest competitor for the first place. The provision was then made for electing the Vice-President as now, so that the President and Vice-President might be in complete harmony, and work together for the success of the administration. This change was a necessary one, a step in the right direction, and other changes will doubtless be made as soon as the wisdom of making them shall become apparent. But the people of the country will be slow to approve of modifications of the organic law without the clearest evidence that the proposed alteration will be an improvement. Notwithstanding the seeming radicalism seen in party movements and excitements, the people of this country are at heart loyal to the established government, and essentially conservative. They are not clamoring for changes for the sake of changes—not even for the election by popular vote. There will be very serious hesitation before demanding that change, so long as there can be no assurance that in the future canvassings for the high office there will be only two candidates in the field, so that a majority of the votes will be certainly given to one or the other. It is clearly undesirable to go into an election by the people, with the strong probability that a choice by a majority is impossible; and it is even less desirable to have such an election decided by a plurality, although on the present plan it sometimes occurs that the defeated candidate receives more votes than the successful one.

If there must be an election by less than a majority, it is better that it be by the voice of the States through the electoral agency than by a plurality of the whole vote. The distribution of the popular vote is something for consideration. The rights of the States are supposed to be better secured by this plan than could be done by merging the whole voting population of the country into one body. The massing of the votes in one section

to override those in another section, and this upon sectional and local issues, is measurably forestalled by this plan. At least this is the impression, and it is manifestly one design of this unique method of expressing the will of the people.

Assuming that the electoral plan is to continue, the question of its improvability is pertinent. Voting by States is the fundamental idea in it, its basal thought, as it is also in the alternative provision for an election by the House of Representatives, in the event of a failure to elect by the electors chosen by the States. It is evident that the notion of State sovereignty, which prevailed prior to the adoption of the Constitution, had something to do with shaping the plan as it was originally made, and as it exists at the present time. It was inevitable that this idea should have prominence in the Constitutional Convention, and have large influence, commanding almost universal assent, while as yet the national union was not consummated; for, while the country was under the tentative articles of confederation, there was extraordinary sensitiveness in the public mind with regard to the independence of the several States, so recently achieved. Some of the States were larger than others, but all were alike independent, and the smaller dreaded over-slaughing or absorption by the larger, and naturally insisted upon protection against any tendency towards such a result in any scheme of federation or union that might be proposed. All eyes were open to catch the first appearance of anything that looked like giving the large and powerful States any advantage over the others, except the natural advantages of territory and population, which could not be affected or controlled by law. The Constitution, when completed, had to be approved by the States separately, in order to its adoption, and this provision for the independent action of the States in choosing the chief executive officer was, no doubt, influential in conciliating those who were reluctant to come into the Union. Whether it secured equality of power in this respect or not, it looked in that direction, and approximated that end as nearly as was possible. Especially when the election fell into the House of Representatives, it had the appearance of giving the smaller States an equal voice with the larger in this important action. There are checks and helps in the system which amount to real advantages, although it is not possible to devise a scheme that will give perfect equality to the States as such, so long as

representation in the electoral college, or in the House of Representatives, is based on population; and population is the only basis on which it can be based. It is, therefore, evident that all expectation of making the small States equal to the large States should be abandoned as unwise and impracticable.

In the present system the advantage of the individual voter for electors is with the voters in the larger States. This is an inequality that should be remedied ; for, while there is no good reason why a State like Rhode Island or Nevada, or some new Territory just coming into statehood, should have as much power in the choice of President as Pennsylvania or New York, there is no reason why the individual voter in the large States should have greater power than the voter in the small State. This contention is not for the equality of States as States, but for the equality of voters as voters. When the election takes place in the House of Representatives, and each State casts a single vote, that vote being determined by the majority of representatives from the State, the small State makes the nearest approach to equality with the large State that is possible under the Constitution. Then the relation of the vote to population is nearly disregarded. The justice of this near approach to equality is not apparent, and now that "the more perfect union" is formed, and the Constitution is in force, which bears directly upon the rights of the people, as well as upon the States as organized bodies, it is not impertinent to assume that the primary reasons for this equality of States have passed out of existence, if they ever had any foundation or substance outside of State pride or local prejudice. The claim for equality which has reason in it is the equality of voters, or the claim that one man's vote shall count for as much as any other man's vote anywhere in the Union.

With the existing method of choosing electors for the State on a common ticket the equality sought is impossible, and yet the inequality is so subtle or so well hidden that some effort is necessary to bring it fully into view. In looking for it, the question to be pursued is not the right of the individual to cast his vote, for that is conceded ; but it has reference to the relative power of a single vote when cast in a large State or in a small State. In other words, it is a question as to whether it is a larger privilege to vote for twenty or thirty electors than it is to vote for three or five. Does one vote cast for each of thirty electors have

a greater effect in the final count than does one vote cast for each of three electors? This is the practical question which deserves elaboration.

In the State of New York the voter casts a ballot for each of thirty-six electors. His vote is counted for each, and each elector chosen by that ballot votes for President; so that the vote of one man bears directly on thirty-six votes in the electoral college. In one respect the man has but one voice, but that one voice is potential in filling many seats in the body which decides the election. In another State each voter has a voice in selecting twelve electors, or one-third the number chosen in New York. His voice counts in determining twelve votes in the electoral college. His influence in the whole body is one-third as great as it would be if he could vote for three times as many electors, as does the vote cast in New York. In another State of still less population, the voter has a voice in the election of three electors, or one-twelfth as many as the voter in New York influences. In this condition of things it is pretty evident that the voter in New York has twelve times the power in the choice of President that he possesses who must exercise the right of suffrage in the smallest State. There is no unfairness in the fact that the larger State should have this preponderance of power, as a State, for the larger voting population justifies this; but that each voter should wield such an excess of power is scarcely compatible with equity and justice. The equality of the power of single votes is destroyed.

It will be alleged in reply to this that the inequality disappears when it is remembered that in the larger State more votes are required to make the majority which elects; but the reply is fallacious, for the trouble is not in the greater or less number of votes requisite to the majority in the large or small State, but it has reference to the power of the single vote. Is not that vote multiplied, or its power increased, in proportion to the number of electors it helps to elect? If so, the lack of equality in the power of the single voter in the different States is demonstrated. This question of majorities will illustrate the point. A single vote is as influential in determining majorities in a large State as in a small State. Suppose that in the great State of New York the electors are all chosen by a majority of eleven hundred—is not that a supposable case? A change of six hundred votes would

put the majority on the other side. That change of six hundred votes would take thirty-six electors from one side and add them to the other side. Then suppose that in Montana the electors are chosen by a majority of eleven hundred votes. A change of six hundred votes would put the majority on the other side. The change of six hundred votes in Montana would take three electors from one side and add them to the other side. Thus it is seen that the six hundred voters in New York have twelve times the power of six hundred voters in Montana. Then, if six hundred voters in New York can wield twelve times the power of six hundred in Montana, who will say that each individual voter does not wield twelve times the power in the former State that he does in the latter? Nor is it possible that twelve votes cast in Montana can equal the one vote cast in New York; for the one vote touches the election of thirty-six electors in New York, while the twelve votes in Montana can only affect three electors, even if they do swell the vote of the three more than the one vote swells the majority of the thirty-six. If the ballot for each elector were cast separately, he of Montana would vote three times, and he of New York thirty-six times. Say not, then, that the ways of this system are equal.

How can equality be secured? It cannot be till voters throughout the country vote for the same number of electors. This requires the election of presidential electors by districts instead of by States. Slight alterations in State constitutions will authorize this, and nothing oppressive would result if the National Constitution should be made to require it. In this way the voice of the people can have free expression and a voter in one part of the Union will become equal to a voter in any other part of the Union. It gives to every one the right to vote for the elector of his choice, with the assurance that his vote will be as influential in determining the composition of the electoral body as will the vote of any other man.

When one of the States adopted this plan, the innovation appeared to be serious enough to elicit comments upon it by President Harrison in his annual message to Congress. His objections to it were as weighty as can be made, but they were not formidable. The dangers arising from the possibility of unfairness in arranging the districts, in the interests of one party at the expense of another party, were emphasized. What is

known in political parlance as the "gerrymander" is an evil that ought to be suppressed, whether electors are elected by districts or not. Members of Congress are so elected, and must be. It is a humiliating confession of weakness to recognize the "gerrymander" as too formidable to be overcome. If the States provide that districting laws shall be enacted only by a concurrent vote of two-thirds of both Houses of the Legislature, the obnoxious gerrymander will be next to impossible, as it will seldom occur in any State that two-thirds of both Houses will consent to palpably unfair legislation. It is simply absurd to refuse to do the fair thing with all the voters of the United States because political tricksters may take advantage of equitable laws to promote partisan ends.

There are other advantages in the district method which existing peculiarities in certain sections render important enough to call forth the profoundest thought. In the State of New York, for example, it is known that the entire electoral vote is frequently determined by the foreign vote in the cities of New York and Brooklyn. In those cities there are hundreds of thousands of voters whose knowledge of this country and its needs has been gained by a brief sojourn in that dense population. They "vote the ticket," of course, and swell the majority of one of the parties, while the other citizens of the State struggle in vain to gain representation in the electoral body, and fail to have a single voice even when they elect many representatives to Congress. Hundreds of thousands of voters have no representative in that body, who choose their own representatives in the State Legislature and the Congress. The great cities overslaugh them, and decide for them, in opposition to their wishes, who shall represent them in the election of President. These rural populations and the voters of the villages and towns of the State, outside of the great city, are as intelligent and as patriotic, and in every respect as well qualified to select their own representatives as are the controlling elements in city populations; yet it so happens that the worst elements in city life give such a preponderance to one of the political parties, that the majority which represents the intelligence of the great State is overborne, and compelled to accept the situation determined on any other than patriotic grounds. The same thing is liable to occur in Illinois, and in Ohio, and in any State in which there is a large city, with a large population of

unassimilated foreign-born voters. The objection is not to allowing legal voters of this class the right to vote, and to choose their own representatives; but it is to a system which makes it possible for them to determine the representation of the entire State. If the electors were chosen by districts, so that each one should vote only for his own representative, the State would have its full number in the electoral body, and yet the great cities and the rural districts would alike choose their own, and all would be fairly represented, and stand on equal grounds. This would be just to the State, and just to the several districts of the State, and to the nation as a whole. In this arrangement no one would be deprived of voting for this choice of electors; no one would vote for a larger number of electors than every other one, while every section would be represented by the choice of its majority, whether in the great city or in the rural districts.

Under a system of this kind a division of the electoral vote of the State would often occur; but that is possible under the present plan, and has occurred without disaster to any interest. The outcome, on the whole, might not be greatly altered, as the change contemplated would be as advantageous to one party as to another; but then every voter would have an equal voice in the result and a more direct representation and a more satisfactory relation to the choice of President. Besides this, every elector would have a distinct constituency of his own and a more direct personal responsibility, which would enhance the value of his office and clothe it with something like the character originally designed for it.

There are other changes which, if made, would add to the dignity of the office of elector, and adapt the provisions of the system itself to the changed conditions of our times. The requirement calling the electors of each State to the State capital, to cast the ballot of the State, and the provision for reporting the result to Congress through the Vice-President, evidently grew out of conditions which no longer exist. This is now the sheerest formality, while the necessity of sealing up the report of the ballot and conveying the document to Washington by special messenger, or otherwise, is not only an arrangement in pursuance of the relations of the States under the Articles of Confederation, but it belongs to the condition of the country with reference to mail and travelling facilities prior to the advent of railroads and

telegraphs. At that time there were reasons for not calling all the electors together to act as one body in the transaction of their business, but those reasons exist no longer. That which was then inconvenient and expensive is now easily practicable.

An electoral body composed of all the electors of all the States would be in fact an Electoral Congress, and it might be in name. The meeting of such a body for the election of President and Vice-President of the United States would be an event worthy the dignity of the nation, and of the offices to be filled. In fulfilling this high function such a Congress might be empowered to count the ballots cast, and to declare the result. If the first ballot did not elect, it might ballot again and again, till an election should be secured. When the electors have each a distinct constituency, and are empowered by legal right to control their own votes, as they are now under the law, there can be no reason for restricting their right to a single ballot. The delegates in the National Conventions are not so restricted in making nominations, nor are members of the State Legislatures in balloting for United States Senators. The electoral body ought to be so constituted that it could be safely empowered to perform its work to completion, even if the first choice of the political parties proved unable to command a majority on the first ballot. This representative body might well be intrusted with as much power as the more loosely constructed conventions of the parties. Of course, this suggestion looks to radical changes, so great indeed that possible difficulties will occur to practical minds, but it is believed that the chief changes contemplated are in the direction of greater conformity to the spirit of our institutions and existing conditions.

In all this it is not forgotten that senatorial electors are to be chosen, as well as district electors. The thing sought being equality in the power of the individual voter in all the States, the principle contended for is not violated by the election of senatorial electors on a common ticket for the State. In that event each voter will vote for one district and two senatorial electors in all the States, great and small alike. While this does not make the States equal, it makes all the voters in all the States equal, giving to every man who votes an equal voice with every other man throughout the Union.

Whether the time is here, or is coming, when it will be ex-

pedient to alter the Constitution so that no State shall have more Senators in the Upper House than it has Representatives in the Lower House, is another question. But it is a question, and one which has much to do with the dignity of that body which Americans have been taught to regard as the noblest and most august legislative body in the world. The common-sense judgment of the people is that any State without population enough to entitle it to two Representatives in the Lower House, the popular branch of Congress, could be amply represented in the Senate by one Senator. At all events, there is and ought to be difference enough between district and senatorial electors, to justify a difference in the manner of their election; and the general-ticket plan for electors-at-large, and the district plan for the district electors, secures equality to the voters, and consistency in the electoral system. Under such a system a solid South, or a solid North, or any other sectional predominance, would be practically impossible. With equal rights for all, equal power in every vote, and equal standards for the privileges of citizenship, the ballot would then prove—

"A weapon that comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod;
But executes a freeman's will
As lightning does the will of God."

S. M. MERRILL.

THE BEST CURRENCY.

BY ALBION W. TOURGÉE.

MR. CHAUNCEY DEPEW recently declared that the United States ought to have "the best currency in the world." The phrase was a happy one, suggestive of much more than its author intended.

Currency, meaning by that the whole denominational medium of exchange which is in use in any particular country, is not only comparative in its character and stability, but is also comparative in its cost, convenience, flexibility, and sufficiency. In the conflict which has been so long waged, and is still pending, between a gold and a silver standard, we have been in danger of forgetting all the elements of a good currency, except its relation to one or the other of these, or to that curious anomaly by which the political theorist sometimes seeks to confuse the thought of the common people, a "bimetallic" standard. The purpose of this article is neither to engage in the controversy of the standards, nor to thresh over the straws of metallic relation, which have been so thoroughly beaten by the flails of contesting theorists during the past few years, but to suggest that "the best currency in the world" is within easy reach of the government of the United States, without any interference with the existing standard of value or any modification of the legal relation between silver and gold; and that the adoption of such a currency would result at the same time in vast reduction of the cost of our circulating medium and the interest charge upon our national indebtedness.

We have come to regard gold, not only as the standard of value, but also as the criterion of efficiency and desirability in currency. We say "currency as good as gold," meaning thereby to express the highest excellence in a medium of exchange. Yet it is a demonstrable fact that the United States has now the oppor-

tunity, acting along its traditional lines and in conformity with the experience of the civilized world, to provide a currency based on a gold standard of value which shall be better than gold itself, that is, shall be always equal with gold in value and so much more desirable than gold, as to be preferred to it by those wishing to hold current funds in large quantities. Not only is this true, but such a currency may be the means of materially reducing the expenditure of the government, while meeting at the same time, without material change in our financial conditions, the prevalent demand for a more abundant currency.

A statement of this character will, no doubt, seem to most persons wholly visionary and absurd, especially when coupled with the farther assertion that it involves no new system or principle in finance, but is simply an application, the plainest and most evident, of universally admitted ones, conflicting with no accepted theorem of financial philosophy save one, which has been accepted only through a mistaken view of a supposed necessity.

The currency of all civilized nations is composed of two elements: coin and credit money. Credit money is always a promise to pay coin—it may be any coin of the realm or some particular kind of coin. It may be the promise of a bank authorized by law to put such currency into circulation for its own profit, or the promise of a nation issued to promote the general welfare of its people. All promises to pay are either redeemable upon demand or payable at some specified time. Three things are necessary to impart the highest desirability to any such promise to pay:

(1.) Certainty of payment according to its terms.

(2.) Assurance that it will readily pass from hand to hand in exchange.

(3.) A cumulative character, causing it to appreciate rather than depreciate in value.

A promise to pay on demand or presentation can only constitute a stable currency while the ability to redeem in the particular form of inherent value in which the same is payable continues, and is known and admitted to exist. As soon as this power of continuous redemption fails, or is even suspected of liability to fail, the desire to secure the redemption of such currency becomes universal; and such currency declines in comparison with one of inherent value.

On the other hand, a promise to pay a sum certain, let us say in gold, at a specific time, with interest, is worth more than gold, if the ability and willingness of the promisor is beyond doubt. For instance, a bond of the United States payable in gold, with interest at four per cent. annually, is worth fifteen or twenty per cent. more than its face, in gold, if it has thirty years to run.

A treasury-note or "greenback," which is a promise to pay, and which by custom, if not by law, has become a promise to pay in gold without interest, whenever presented for redemption—is kept equal in value with gold by two things: It is made receivable for all debts the same as gold, and is redeemed whenever presented.

We see then, that continuous redeemability, plus the legal-tender quality, keeps a non-interest bearing obligation of the United States at par with gold, while an interest-bearing obligation of the United States, payable on a day certain, is worth considerably more than gold.

Now it is evident that if the special qualities which distinguish the bond from the treasury-note, to wit, interest-bearing and a specific time of payment, were imparted to the treasury-note, it would constitute a currency worth more than gold. Is there any insuperable obstacle to giving the treasury-note the desirable qualities of the bond, to wit, terminable redemption and interest-bearing in addition to its legal-tender quality? There are apparent objections, but they are based on detail and methods rather than on principle, as will be shown hereafter.

Before considering what may be termed the mechanism of such change, it is desirable to note what would be its effect on the "greenback" itself.

There have been four objections made to the legal-tender treasury-note as we now have it:

1. It makes something besides gold and silver money. This has been legally decided against the objection, but whatever force it still has would militate against the proposed currency.

2. A second objection, strongly urged at first and recently repeated with special emphasis, is that a legal-tender treasury-note constitutes a forced loan by which the people are compelled to lend to the government without interest. The force this might have had at first is greatly weakened by the general acceptability of "greenback" currency during a period of thirty-

four years among a people by no means chary of expressing dissatisfaction. It would, however, be entirely cured by making the legal-tender note an interest-bearing obligation.

3. A third objection is that the government, by its issue, would be "going into the business of banking," and thereby depriving associations of individual capitalists of what is assumed to be a natural right to furnish the paper currency of the country. The claim is an absurd one. All credit currency, whether provided directly by a government or indirectly by its agents or banks, derives its stability and desirable character from governmental regulation. The very right to emit denominational bills payable on demand is a privilege granted by government. Without such grant no bank of issue can exist, and charters granting such privilege are given, not for the benefit of the users of currency, but for the profit of traffickers in currency. A sovereign power has always the right to do what it is authorized to grant others power to do, if it be for the general welfare and collective good that it should. In other words, it is a question of policy and not one of right or power, whether the sovereign provide the paper legal-tender which civilization has demonstrated to be an essential part of the currency of every commercial nation, or pay a bank a bonus to provide it. We began in 1862 to do it by direct action of the government. England began in 1832, and France in 1838, to grant the privilege of issuing legal-tender notes as a valuable monopoly to specific banks—the Bank of England and the Bank of France. This privilege has been largely extended, but there is a strong demand that our government shall cease to do directly what a half century of experience of these great nations proves to be desirable when done indirectly. In our case, it is especially a question of economy both on the part of the government and of the users of currency, the people. In both respects, it will be seen that the proposed change represents a decided economical advantage.

4. A fourth objection, and the one which has been most forcibly called to the public notice of late, is the fact that by its constant redeemability, the "greenback" constitutes an "endless chain" by which gold is drawn out of the Treasury, making it necessary to borrow gold to supply the deficiency thus created. While it has been questioned whether this would be the case if a sufficient revenue were provided, there is no doubt that it is true,

under present conditions, and might exist even with abundant revenue, if the balance of trade should be against us, or should for any reason call for an afflux of gold to meet the demand.

This objection is wholly obviated by giving the treasury-note a terminal redeemability only—that is, by making each specific note payable at a given date or on presentation within a specific period, as during a particular year. As the number redeemable during any year could be regulated, only such amount as would be easily within the power of the Treasury to meet could be used "to draw gold from the Treasury" during that time. Terminal redeemability would, therefore, put an end to the "endless chain" objection just as certainly and three times as cheaply as "endless" borrowing and a constant issue of bonds.

But what are the means by which this result is attainable? Are they simple and certain or complex and doubtful? Let us see. We have now $346,000,000 of legal-tender, non-interest bearing treasury-notes, which the government is required by express enactment to keep in circulation; that is, to redeem when presented and pay out again when demanded or when there is opportunity. By this means, they are used over and over again by traffickers in currency to obtain gold for export or to meet the constantly increasing volume of maturing obligations, which are payable in gold, making the Treasury, in effect, a free brokerage establishment for all who have any specific need for gold coin.

Suppose that, instead of re-issuing these continuously redeemable notes, an equivalent amount of denominational notes bearing one per cent. interest, payable in gold, having five years to run and retaining the legal-tender quality, be issued in their place. There is no doubt that the holders of greenbacks would be willing to make such exchange because an interest-bearing obligation is always preferable to a non-interest bearing one. Divide the whole amount of such issues into classes so that one class shall be redeemable and one exchangeable for like currency on presentation at any time during the sixth year after issue, with the accrued interest on both payable in gold coin. This would give, when such order was once established, say $35,000,000 payable each year and $35,000,000 renewable each year. It must be remembered that the greenback is a debt, and this would provide for its easy extinguishment in ten years. During this time only $35,000,000 a year could be used to draw gold from the

Treasury, while it would be easy to furnish gold for five times that amount by renewing the original provision of the legal-tender notes that they be not receivable for duties on imports. While the legal-tender note bore no interest it was, perhaps, necessary to make it receivable for all debts in order to keep it at par; but when it becomes an interest-bearing obligation the right and policy of making it non-receivable for import duties is at once apparent.

But this is something more than a scheme for the retirement of the greenback; in fact, it is really a plan for its perpetuation. We have in addition to the $346,000,000 legal-tender notes, $343,000,000 silver certificates and $141,000,000 of demand notes of 1890. Some of these have been redeemed and are probably now in the Treasury; but the figures will serve for illustration. The silver certificates are nominally secured by a deposit of silver bullion. As a fact, this deposit is no security at all. It is merely an asset of the government, and the resources of the country are so great that it is a matter of no consequence whether this particular asset is applied to this particular debt or not. These certificates pass as money simply because of the faith and credit of the government. Suppose this amount of $480,000,000 of non-interest bearing demand notes were exchanged for a like amount of one per cent. interest-bearing legal-tender notes, running five years, payable and redeemable in classes, as in the case of the greenbacks. This would make one-tenth of this class, or $48,000,000 and the interest on a like sum, payable each year.

But this is not all. We have $100,000,000 of four per cent. bonds, which fall due in 1904, and $550,000,000, which fall due in 1907. Provision should be made to substitute one per cent. legal-tenders for them. How can it be done? Simply by offering the holders of these bonds their choice between gold and interest-bearing legal-tender notes. There will be no question as to the result. A gold, interest-bearing, legal-tender note, having five years to run, and then payable or renewable with payment of accrued interest, will always be preferred to gold coin which bears no interest.

This leads to the consideration of the objection, sure to be made to any such form of currency, that it will be hoarded as an investment instead of being all the time in circulation as money.

This objection would be a valid one if the rate of interest were more than one per cent., or the time the notes would run without renewal more than five years. Let us examine, however, the probable and reasonable operation of the system proposed. Suppose these notes to be substituted for the present greenbacks, the silver certificates and the treasury-notes of 1890, amounting to about $940,000,000, and that enough be added thereto to make one billion of such currency. This would just about meet the present deficit and furnishes a convenient sum for comparison. Of this amount, let us say that one-tenth is redeemable and one-tenth renewable each year; that is, one-tenth would be payable with five per cent. accrued interest and one-tenth renewable with five per cent. accrued interest to be paid each year. At the end of the third year each dollar of these notes would, it is true, represent, with accrued interest, $1.03; but, in order to realize this sum for it, the buyer would have to hold it two years, when he would receive five per cent. accrued interest, or 2½ per cent. a year on his investment. Evidently there would be no temptation to hoard such currency on these terms.

At the end of the fourth year, the man purchasing at par would receive five per cent. by holding it one year. In other words, he would get five per cent. on his investment. This is a fair profit, and it is unquestionable that during this period capitalists would buy up this currency, and that one-fifth of it, or $200,000,000, would be all the time slightly above par, and much of it retired from actual circulation. What would be the result? We have now, it is estimated, about $600,000,000 of gold coin. Of this hardly a dollar is in actual circulation. Except a rapidly diminishing quantity on the Pacific Coast, all of it is held for possible speculative advantage. If we make $200,000,000 of our currency worth more than gold, precisely that amount of gold will have to be put in circulation in order to obtain it. In other words, in accordance with "Gresham's rule," as soon as we put in circulation a paper currency worth more than gold, the result will be that the paper currency will be preferred for hoarding, and gold put in circulation instead. The ultimate result will be a paper currency always worth as much as gold and one-fifth of the time actually worth more than gold.

The effect of such a system would be, therefore: (1.) To transfer as much of our national bonded debt as might be desir-

able for the use of the country, into currency directly, instead of through the agency of bonds; (2.) To provide for the gradual discharge of so much of the debt as is not required for use as such currency; and (3.) To make possible a permanent loan upon the lowest conceivable interest rate which shall itself constitute the cheapest and best currency in the world.

The cheapness of such a currency is clearly shown by comparison with our national-bank currency. The whole cost of $1,000,000,000 of interest-bearing, legal-tender notes under such a system would be $10,000,000 a year. There is a theory that in some way or other the credit of the stockholders of the national banks adds to the stability of their issues. The idea is purely whimsical. The stability of the notes of these banks is dependent wholly on the fact that they have deposited with the Treasurer of the United States bonds of the United States for an amount exceeding the sum of their issues. This makes them good, no matter whether the stockholders of the bank are solvent or not—so good that the issues of a broken bank pass current just as readily as those of the staunchest institution in the country. At present we have about $225,000,000 of this currency secured by about $250,000,000 in bonds. On these bonds the country pays four per cent. interest, or $10,000,000 annually, so that the first cost of $225,000,000 of national-bank currency which is not a legal-tender is exactly equal to the cost of one billion of interest-bearing legal-tender notes of the character described herein.

How would such a system affect the gold and silver controversy now pending? It would leave the existing gold standard in operation and would also leave silver coin a full legal-tender as it now is. By reducing the demand for gold to maturing gold-contracts, as it evidently would, it would bring gold into circulation, and, by strengthening the whole currency, would tend to approximate the values of the two metals.

It would, however, do much more towards the solution of the money problem than at first sight appears. Underneath the silver question, giving it strength and vitality outside of the silver-producing States, is the very general demand of the people for more currency. Outside of the silver-producing States themselves, the demand for the free coinage of silver rests almost wholly upon the desire for more money. That this demand is a just and logical one

there can be no doubt. With our entire gold coin held for speculative advantage and a large part of the present legal-tender notes impounded in the Treasury, there is a deficiency of currency which only the long-continued depression makes in any way endurable. The demand for currency must greatly increase with the return of prosperity. The plan proposed gives an abundant currency without possibility of inflation—the very thing the great majority of the supporters of free silver desire—without any of the dangers to be apprehended from the removal of restriction on the coinage of the white metal.

It must steadily be kept in mind that what should be aimed at in all action concerning the currency, is not the maintenance of any specific theory, but (1.) stability, sufficiency, and elasticity of the currency; (2.) the removal of doubt or objection to the stability and equality of all parts of the currency; (3) economy, especially the reduction of the interest-charge now greatly swollen by the issue of bonds to secure the gold reserve, and (4.) the use of as large a portion of the public debt as may be desirable as the basis of our currency in the cheapest and most easily regulated form.

These purposes, it is confidently believed, will be most readily and effectively secured by the plan here briefly outlined. Its advantages are that it avoids the gold and silver controversy; utilizes the public debt in such a way as to make it a veritable blessing; removes the reproach of "fiatism" from the greenback; provides an abundant currency, reduces the interest charge on the public debt, makes it impossible to use the treasury-note as an "endless chain" to draw gold from the treasury, provides a paper currency the whole of which is as good as gold, and one-fifth of it better than gold, uses the public credit as the foundation for the currency directly, without paying a bonus of interest, privilege or exemption, to any bank or system of banks for doing it indirectly, and, by reducing the demand for gold, permits the limited supply of that metal to perform its legitimate function in the liquidation of ultimate balances in trade.

It is submitted that a currency that will accomplish these things is well entitled to the name "the best currency in the world," and also, that it is eminently fit that the American people, the richest in productive capacity and the most notable in development and experience, should lead the world in applying reason

and common sense to questions of currency and finance rather than mere theory and hypothesis, based on infirm speculation in regard to the relative value of two metals, a fact which depends chiefly upon the supply of each : instead of maundering about "the beneficence of God which has supplied these two great coin-metals to serve as the foundation of every well-regulated currency," or claiming, on the other hand, that "the only secure basis for an assured prosperity lies in a currency every part of which is at all times exchangeable for or redeemable in gold," which proposition is too absurd to be termed a falsehood, being one of those things which men assert to be true until they come to believe them, however impossible that may be. There never has been in modern times, an hour when the whole credit currency of any nation was "exchangeable or redeemable in gold and probably never will be." What is true, and it is all that any man can safely affirm, is that there are periods during which the popular confidence in the currency of different nations has been so great that all forms of money authorized by law are regarded with equal favor as mediums of exchange—whether gold, silver, copper or paper—because each man believes that his neighbor will accept what he himself receives in exchange for anything that he may wish to sell, and that as much of it as may be presented for payment will be redeemed as stipulated. The best foundation for the credit-currency of a great nation is the national credit. The only question to be determined is whether that credit shall be used directly by paying interest to the users of currency, or indirectly by paying a much higher rate of interest to the holders of bonds on which a substitute currency shall be based. As long as a nation's credit is good, its legal-tender notes, bearing never so low a rate of interest, will be equal with gold in desirability and better than gold as they approach maturity ; and such a currency is three or four times cheaper than one based on bonds. Gold serves its true purpose as an ultimate standard of value, but as a medium of exchange, interest-bearing treasury-notes of the United States would easily rank as the best currency which civilization has yet devised. That there will some time be an international paper currency, upheld by the guaranty of several leading nations of the world, is more than probable. Such a currency would do more than all the ships and armies, treaties and tri-

bunals of arbitration put together, to preserve the peace of the world. But as long as the nation is the political unit and taxation is required to meet the principal and interest of a national indebtedness amounting to thirty dollars per capita of our entire population, the most economic and efficient addition that can be made to our present coinage will be a currency consisting of interest-bearing, short-term, legal-tender notes, taking the place not only of our non-interest-bearing treasury-notes and silver certificates, but also of our bonds, as they mature, so long as there is a demand for a more abundant currency. It is the belief of many, perhaps a majority of those who have considered the subject disinterestedly, that the present depression is largely due to a lack of currency, and it is quite possible that, with the distrust of silver, and the hoarding of gold, this is correct. If so, there is opportunity to meet such demand without delay or risk.

Another advantage would result from such a currency, in that the fear that by some turn of political fortune, the silver in the Treasury might be used to liquidate the coin-certificates would be removed, and thereby all suspicion of stability in our outstanding currency obliterated. We should at once have a currency, every dollar of which would be equal to every other dollar, and all equal with gold in desirability. By following the example of all other nations, and withholding all issues of paper money under five dollars, it is quite possible to largely increase the use of silver coin, and so open a way for the use of the $400,000,000 of silver now lying in the treasury. Of course no interest-bearing legal-tender should be issued for a less denomination, thus leaving the field of small transactions open entirely to silver coin. The restoration of entire confidence in the currency by the elimination of doubt arising from a continuing threat to liquidate paper currency in silver, will permit a much larger use of silver coin than heretofore. This, while not directly enhancing consumption, so as to meet the wishes of the silver producers, because of the present supply of silver-bullion in the treasury, will do more to rehabilitate silver as a coin-metal throughout the world, than would the attempt to substitute it for all other currency by the present system of certification with the impossible pledge of parity of value, which is the real essence of the demand for free coinage of silver.

ALBION W. TOURGÉE.

PROSPECTS OF EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN E. GORST, VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

THE chief obstacles to the progress of education in England are party spirit and religious intolerance. Proposals for educational reform are discussed and decided, not in a philosophical spirit, but with all the acrimony of partisans. Yet it is admitted that the case is a very urgent one; that England is engaged in a struggle with her foreign competitors not only for the supremacy but even for the very existence of her industries; that her workers are worse instructed than their rivals, and are on that account going to the wall; and that better education, both elementary and technical, is vital to the continuance of her prosperity. It is the fact that in both town and country elementary instruction is so backward that, even if adequate technical schools were provided, the mass of the people are unfitted to take full advantage of them. Yet, notwithstanding all this, English statesmen will postpone reform indefinitely if they can see their way to secure a party advantage thereby. The only hope is that public opinion may appreciate, before it is too late, the position of education, both elementary and technical; may become agreed as to the direction in which development ought to take place, and may force Parliament and the government to grapple with the difficulties which have to be overcome.

The origin of all education in England was voluntary; there were no elementary schools established by public authority before 1870; there were no technical schools so established before 1890; and there are no public colleges for the training of teachers at the present moment. The duty of the State to assist elementary education was fulfilled by subsidizing schools established by the philanthropic efforts of religious bodies. The defect of this

system was that it could not cover the ground. In the poorer quarters of great cities, where masses of workers were congregated, there were multitudes of children requiring instruction, while the richer classes, by whose subscriptions alone the necessary schools could be maintained, had gone to live elsewhere. It was the necessity of making some provision for elementary education in such places that gave rise to the Education Act of 1870. The principle of that act was the division of England into school districts, consisting of the metropolis, the boroughs, and the parishes outside of boroughs. Every one of these districts which had not sufficient accommodation for the children who ought to be in school could be compelled to form a School Board, which was under a legal obligation to equip and furnish the necessary schools, and which had the power to levy rates to an unlimited amount to pay for them. This Act has been in operation for a quarter of a century. Its results have differed greatly in the boroughs and in the country districts. The questions now affecting town and country schools are so distinct from each other that it will conduce to a clearer understanding if an entirely separate consideration is given to each class.

Two-fifths of the children of school age are to be found in the metropolis and in the large county boroughs having their own school boards. In these the Act of 1870 has worked in a most satisfactory manner; the members of the boards have been generally elected from those who are sincerely desirous of promoting good education and who take a lively interest in municipal government, and they have established thoroughly efficient schools. Some persons attach extraordinary value to the fact that the members of school boards are elected for the express purpose of managing schools. It is doubtful whether any real advantage has been obtained by this arrangement, and whether the same results would not have been attained if the school authority had been a committee of the Municipal Council.

However this may be, the effect of the school-board system in boroughs has been greatly to raise the level of elementary education, and at the same time to increase its cost, with the general assent, however, of the rate-payers who have to furnish the money. There are two obstacles which hinder the full measure of success being attained. The first is the short time which the children remain in the elementary schools. Till recently, the age

for exemption from full-time attendance at school was ten. It is now eleven, and in some boroughs has been raised by by-laws to as much as thirteen. The value of the child's labor is too great a temptation to parents and employers, and the general interest the community have in keeping children longer at school is not sufficiently realized to counteract this strong motive. But if we choose to sacrifice our children at so early an age to the necessities of their parents or to the industries of the country, we must not expect to find them so apt to receive technical instruction as the German or Swiss child who has been kept at school to the age of fourteen. Until the school age is raised, English children cannot be turned out by the borough board schools as well equipped for further instruction as the Continental children who are to be their future rivals.

The second obstacle to complete success is the fact that the school board system in boroughs does not cover the ground. Of seven children educated in boroughs, three are educated in voluntary schools, as against four in board schools, and these voluntary schools do not in general possess the means of giving so efficient an education in secular learning as the board schools. On this ground many persons, zealous for the improvement of secular education, hope that the voluntary schools will soon suffer painless extinction; but their hope is not likely to be realized, for two reasons:

First, because of the cost. The subscriptions, the unpaid management, and the buildings of the voluntary schools, save the rate-payers a considerable expense which they would have to incur if the voluntary system were abandoned.

The second reason which prevents the extinction of voluntary schools is the religious sentiment of a considerable number of the people. The people of England desire generally that religious instruction should be given to their children, and accordingly religion is taught by most school boards. It is a new kind of religion established by law and popularly known by the name of "Undenominationalism," and it consists of so much of the doctrines of Christianity as do not conflict with the tenets of any particular church or sect. The Nonconformists generally like this religion, it differs little from what they teach, or used to teach, in their own denominational schools; the parents of the children, who are usually indifferent to the particular doctrine which is taught to

their children, do not raise any objection, especially as the teachers, who have become, as Mr. Disraeli stated in 1870, "a new sacerdotal order," are a sacerdotal order which does not attempt to make proselytes. But the system of undenominational teaching is objected to by a considerable section of the Church of England, by the Roman Catholics, possibly by a few bodies of religious dissenters, and by the Jews. The "Undenominationalists" meet the objectors with religious intolerance. They consider that people ought to be satisfied with their teaching, and if not that it should be forced upon them.

It is the determination to have definite religious teaching on the part of a considerable proportion of the population, that will prevent the absorption of denominational schools. They would not be utterly destroyed even if the parliamentary grant were to be wholly withdrawn. If these schools are, therefore, sure to remain, it is the interest of the nation that they should be maintained in an efficient condition. At present, although there are numerous exceptions, it is true, as a general rule, that the secular instruction given in the voluntary schools in boroughs is inferior to that given in the board schools. The expenditure of the former is less; upon an average in boroughs the voluntary school managers spend from local sources ten shillings per child in average attendance, while board schools spend twenty-five shillings, a difference of fifteen shillings per child; and thirteen shillings of this difference is accounted for by a difference in the amount spent on the teaching staff. The teachers in voluntary schools are paid lower salaries, the assistants have lower qualifications, the proportion of children to teachers is greater, and child labor is more extensively employed. Thus it is evident that if the voluntary schools are to be maintained in a proper condition of efficiency the managers must have more money. They cannot obtain this by increased subscriptions, for in the boroughs the subscribers to voluntary schools have also to pay their full rate to board schools, and they are unwilling to submit to the injustice of bearing a double burden. In board school districts the subscriptions to voluntary schools in proportion to the children maintained are considerably lower than in districts which have no school boards.

If denominational schools can expect no further support from voluntary subscribers, they can only look either to an increased

grant from the imperial government, or to aid from the borough rates. The objection to the former is that it can neither be adequate nor permanent. The difference in expenditure between the voluntary and board schools is, as above stated, fifteen shillings per child ; and a grant of four shillings per child, which is all that is likely to be obtained from the Imperial Exchequer, would go a very small way towards placing the two classes of schools upon an equality ; besides this, it is not reasonable to suppose that the cost per child in board schools will be arrested at the figure of twenty-five shillings. It has increased greatly since 1870, and no one can say precisely where it will stop. To attempt to limit by a hard and fast line the cost of elementary education is as absurd as to attempt to limit the cost of a gun or a war ship. The rivalry of nations is continually increasing the cost of these instruments of war, and the rivalry of nations may continually increase the cost of education. Besides, not being adequate, there is no security that the grant from the Exchequer would be permanent. An act of Parliament is no security, even if the House of Lords were powerful enough to withstand its repeal, for if a party were to come hereafter into office determined to prevent the differential treatment of voluntary schools, they could cut off supplies in the House of Commons, and render impossible the distribution of any exceptional grant.

The other method suggested of giving to the managers of denominational schools the means of improving the secular instruction is by assistance out of the rates. In this matter there are two parties concerned, the managers and the rate-payers, and both have a common interest in securing thorough efficiency. The managers are ready to furnish buildings and management for the common purpose, provided they are allowed in return to give such religious instruction as their particular views demand. The rate-payers want to have sound secular education given to the children, and are indifferent to the particular religious instruction afforded so long as liberty of conscience is secured. If no obstacles were thrown in the way these two parties would inevitably come together and make an agreement. It was originally proposed in the Act of 1870 that such power should be given to the town councils of the boroughs ; it was owing to party considerations that this power was struck out of the bill.

It is perhaps too much to expect that Parliament will confer

on town councils full power to act in this matter as they think best for the interest of the ratepayers ; for although in England people express themselves generally in favor of local self-government they are seldom willing to leave discretion to local authorities unless they feel certain that the discretion would be exercised in the way which they approve ; but Parliament might be willing to prescribe a form of contract which should be allowed to be made between the party representing the rate payers and the managers of denominational schools as the consideration on which they should receive assistance out of the rates. It is clear that relief given to the managers of voluntary schools by means of a rate-aid would be both adequate and permanent. It would be adequate, because it would be the interest of the party representing the rate-payers to secure full efficiency in secular instruction, and it would be permanent, because if arrangements acceptable to local authorities were once in satisfactory working order, Parliament would find it quite impossible to disturb them.

There are certain boroughs in which the generally successful Act of 1870 does not work satisfactorily, because in them the burden which the act imposes on the rate-payers is intolerable. These are boroughs in which an abnormal proportion of the inhabitants are poor; in which there are a multitude of children to teach, and a very low ratable value upon which to levy rates. Such a difficulty was foreseen in the Act of 1870 and was supposed to be provided for. It was then thought that seven shillings and six pence per child would be about the average amount which the local rates would have to supply, and that about three pence in the pound would be about the average rate which would meet such a demand; it was, therefore, prescribed by the Act of 1870 that where the rate of three pence in the pound did not raise an amount of seven shillings and six pence per child the local contribution should be supplemented by such a Parliamentary grant as would make up the deficiency. Now that the cost per child to be defrayed out of local resources has risen to twenty-five shillings, such a provision has become wholly inadequate. If, in boroughs like West Ham and Gateshead, inhabited by a population which works in London and Newcastle, the schools are to be kept efficient, either much more imperial assistance must be provided, or the areas must be included for purposes of education in the cities to which they economically belong.

Of the remaining three-fifths of the children, many are, it is true, in boroughs and urban parishes in which the position of education approaches more or less nearly to that of the great cities, but a large proportion are in rural parishes where the Education Act of 1870 has been much less successful, and where the general level of education is very far below the city standard. It is the opinion of those who are experienced in elementary education that, in country districts, schools under the charge of school boards are generally inferior to those which have voluntary managers. Rural school boards are costly and inefficient, and have failed to establish schools which are superior to the voluntary schools around them. Yet there is no part of the country in which education is more necessary to the preservation of English industry. Manufacturing districts are still struggling against their foreign competitors, and are in many cases holding their own; but the agricultural interest is already beaten. The greater part of the food of the English people must of necessity be supplied by foreign competitors. But not only are bread and meat, the great staples of agricultural production, imported from abroad, but such articles as eggs, poultry, butter, and vegetables, which might be produced in unlimited quantities at home, are supplied to a great extent from Normandy, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark.

If anyone contrasts the elementary and technical instruction imparted to the children of the peasantry in these countries and in England, as well as the amounts spent by the respective governments thereon, there is no reason for surprise at the defeat of English agriculture; and it is impossible to refrain from asking whether better education of the people would not tend more to the relief of agricultural depression than remedies like bimetallism or protection. The understandings of all those who are connected with the cultivation of the soil appear to be darkened. The landowners exhibit that dislike to intellectual development which is characteristic of a territorial aristocracy; the farmers regard the imitation of the methods of their forefathers as the highest agricultural art and scoff at the teachings of science; and the laborer's children are turned out of school to scare crows when eleven years old, and often by the connivance of the school attendance officers, who are under the thumb of the farmers, at a much earlier age. After leaving school the children

get no further instruction; they have no means of keeping up the little knowledge they have obtained; and in a few years they forget everything they have learned, and are often incapable even of reading and writing. How can such a population compete with the French agriculturists, carefully trained in schools and colleges in the art they are to practise? The mere distribution of a capitation grant from government amongst the country schools would not raise rural education. Unless ear-marked and appropriated to specific purposes, it would all go in relief of subscriptions and rates. As between board and voluntary schools, the case of the towns is reversed; in the country the latter are better off than the former; there is no competition and no necessity for levelling up as in the towns; the voluntary schools can hold their own without further pecuniary support.

The rates levied in school-board districts are a greater burden upon the people than the subscriptions in parishes which have voluntary schools; it is rather indeed the board schools that require financial assistance to enable the instruction given in them to be levelled up to the same efficiency as that given by their rivals. So general has become the conviction of the disadvantage of having a school board in a country district, that in many parishes voluntary rates are cheerfully paid by the inhabitants in order to escape such a catastrophe, and when a country parish lapses into a school-board district it is generally the result, not of want of money, but of some parochial quarrel. No improvement in education is possible in rural districts until the voluntary schools are grouped by some system of federation, and until the areas of school districts are enlarged and some educational authority is provided which is more fit to manage schools than the village board. Until such an enlargement takes place, there is no possibility of establishing in rural districts any plan for a common training of the young teachers; there is no opportunity for the employment of itinerant teachers to go from school to school; and there is no scope for an organizing teacher who might improve the character of education throughout a large district.

The defective character of rural education was proved in 1891, when a considerable sum in the hands of the Exchequer, which was originally intended for the extinction of public-house licenses, and which is popularly known as "The Drink Money," came into the hands of the county councils for the purpose of

promoting technical instruction. Whenever the council of an agricultural county attempted to apply these funds directly to the instruction of the mass of people, the operation proved a failure. Those councils which applied their funds to the technical instruction of teachers no doubt succeeded in filtering some amount of knowledge into the rural mind, but the lectures upon bee-keeping, cottage gardening, poultry-keeping, cookery, and so forth, which were delivered in rural villages, were but little frequented by the peasantry and their families, and the technical instruction afforded was enjoyed by an entirely different class from that for which it was intended. It is thus evident that, as a preliminary to any attempt to give to the cultivator of the soil in England the knowledge of his art which is possessed by his rivals on the Continent, it is necessary to improve his elementary education, so as to make him fit to receive higher learning.

The action of the government, which is intended to promote in England education higher than elementary, is ill-designed and ineffective. Public money is spent for this purpose through three distinct channels.

First, the Science and Art Department, which is a branch of the Education Department, distributes grants to all schools and classes which give instruction in science and art upon a defined system. It gives this money as a payment for results, so much for every pupil who passes an examination prescribed by the department in various branches of science and art. Whether payment by results is a good method for promoting the particular kind of instruction for which grants are given may be doubted, but at all events it has the effect of injuring and depressing those subjects of instruction which are not within the curriculum ; the literary side of education has suffered severely in many of our secondary schools from the stimulus given by the Science and Art Department to particular subjects, and it is very likely that on the whole the distribution of these grants has produced as much evil as good.

The second source through which public money is spent in promoting secondary education is through the operation of the Technical Instruction Acts, the first of which was passed in 1889. Under these acts the councils of counties and county boroughs are empowered to levy a rate, and spend the proceeds in the promotion of technical instruction, either by subsidizing independ-

ent institutions, or by establishing institutions of their own. The grant of the "drink money," above referred to, in 1891, put considerable means into their hands, and enabled them to carry the provisions of the Technical Instruction Acts into practical effect without adding to local burdens. The action of the local authorities and the expenditure of the "drink money" must be confined to what is defined in the acts as "technical or manual instruction"; but the definition of the former includes all the subjects of science and art for which grants are given, and any other form of instruction (including modern languages and commercial and agricultural subjects) sanctioned by the Science and Art Department on the representation of a local authority that such a form of instruction is required by the circumstances of its district. With so wide a definition, the Technical Instruction Acts might be so extended as to be applicable to all secondary education without any violent disturbance of their existing operation.

The third way in which public money is expended in the promotion of secondary education is through the higher grade schools established in many of the great cities by the school boards. The school boards are in this particular exceeding the functions for which they were originally designed; but in the absence of any more regular mode of providing the people with that secondary education which the necessity of the times so urgently demands, their proceedings are undoubtedly highly approved by the people for whom they act; and any attempt to curtail by legislation the operation of school boards in this direction, without providing some better alternative method by which the wants of the public could be supplied, would be unpopular.

Through these three sources a considerable amount of public money is expended upon secondary education. It amounted in 1894 to £1,424,404, and it might have amounted, if all the powers of the various acts had been made use of, to £2,381,184. There is, however, no concert between these different authorities; their operations seriously overlap. Schools are inspected by several sets of inspectors, and draw their funds from distinct and different sources; there is urgent need for co-ordination to prevent the waste of effort which must otherwise prevail. A Royal Commission on Secondary Education, which reported in 1895, declared that of the loss now incurred through the want of coherence and correlation, it was impossible to speak too strongly;

that unfortunately, so far from tending to cure itself, it was an evil which every day struck its roots deeper; that vested interests were being created which would stand in the way of the needed reforms ; that the difficulty of introducing the needful coherence and correlation became constantly greater, and would be more serious a year or two thence than it was at that time. It is indispensable to have for this purpose a paramount education-authority in every district, through which alone public money should flow. That district should be the county, because that is already the area of the Technical Instruction Acts. The county authority should have both primary and secondary education under its jurisdiction; first, because these two shade insensibly into one another, and it is impossible to draw a line, with all the subjects of primary education on one side and all those of seconday education on the other; and secondly, because the higher grade schools, which are processes of the elementary education system, already occupy the ground. Two separate authorities would be in conflict from the outset, and there would be a certain margin of education to which each party would assert its claim, and which it would be impossible to assign satisfactorily to either.

It is obvious from this survey of the condition and prospects of education in England that the early attention of the government and of Parliament to this subject is most urgently demanded ; but if every attempt to promote the reform and development necessary for the progress of education is to be received in the spirit of party politicians, and to be recklessly thwarted for the sake of a party victory, and if the difficulties which have been pointed out are to be made greater still by the infusion of sectarian and religious animosity, it is very improbable that a system of education can be established which will enable the workers of England to compete on fair terms with their foreign rivals. Public opinion, has, however, already, to a considerable extent, removed questions of foreign policy and of the national defence from the party arena ; it may do the same for national education, and compel both parties to shape their policy with a due regard to national interests.

JOHN E. GORST.

A HINDRANCE TO OUR FOREIGN TRADE.

BY THOMAS R. JERNIGAN, U. S. CONSUL-GENERAL TO CHINA.

THE feeling of delicacy in writing on a subject in which it might be alleged I am interested is quieted by the belief that the very suspicion of partiality or interestedness will be repelled by the frankness of my statements. Our consular service was organized to promote the commerce of the United States and due consideration will not be withheld from the views of those who write to perfect the efficiency of that agency.

During the first administration of President Cleveland I served three years as Consul of the United States at Osaka and Hiogo, Japan. The commerce of the port of Osaka and Hiogo doubled during those three years over any preceding three, and the value of American trade shared the increase. I kept before me the monthly reports of the Osaka and Hiogo Chamber of Commerce, noted the figures that told of the commercial prosperity of the port, and studied the circumstances to which it was due. I made the acquaintance of the business men there, cultivated friendly relations with the native and foreign officials, and had at my command the best sources of information on commercial subjects. But the experience thus gained during a three years' residence at one of the most prosperous ports of Asia soon ceased to be of practical use in furthering the commerce of my country; for at the end of that period I received permission, which I did not ask for, to deliver to my successor the seal and records of the consulate there.

On the 10th of May, 1894, I entered upon the duties of the office of Consul-General of the United States at Shanghai. On my way to Shanghai, the ship in which I sailed from Yokohama stopped for twenty-four hours at the port of my old consulate, Osaka and Hiogo. There I met several of my former consular

colleagues. They were serving in the same capacity as when I had left them. They had grown with the commercial growth of the port, and were familiar with every movement of trade; and, fully equipped by the experience which gives the opportunity for intelligent study, they were prepared to utilize every changing phase of business for enlarging and extending to new products the trade relations of the countries they represented.

These facts are here recalled to illustrate a principle. Those Consuls whose tenure of office had not been interrupted possessed decided advantages over a Consul entering for the first time upon the duties of a consulate. The new Consul would have to assiduously apply himself to learn what his older colleagues had long since learnt. Their tutelage had passed, while his had only begun. And while he was familiarizing himself with the business peculiarities of the port of his new official residence, making the acquaintance of the merchants and studying their characteristics, business and social, his older colleagues would be in a position to measure the importance of the bearings of new commercial questions arising and to respond promptly to any fresh conditions which might be developed by a growing commerce.

At the first meeting of the consular body at Shanghai which I attended, I was in the presence of the representatives of fourteen nations. Near me sat the Consul-General of Great Britain. He had been in the consular service of his country for nearly twenty years, was a lawyer by education, familiar with every detail of the intricate machinery of consular and mixed courts in China, and ripe in knowledge of the practice and theory of trade and commerce in Asia. Not far from him sat the French Consul-General, and he too was guided in representing his country by the experience of almost a quarter of a century. At the table around which we sat there were several men who had witnessed the coming and going of five different Consuls-General of the United States at Shanghai. It was natural in the presence of such an assemblage of experienced officers to hesitate in advancing views on subjects before the consular body, but each Consul-General was the sole representative of his country on the occasion, and as I contrasted my feelings then with my feelings when I first met, on a similar occasion, my consular colleagues at Osaka and Hiogo, I felt that my experience of three years had made my introduction to official life at Shanghai far less embarrassing.

There is another feature of our consular system which merits consideration with a view to improvement. Contrasting this feature of our system with the corresponding one in the consular system of the great commercial nations of Europe, the conclusion is most unfavorable to our own. I refer to the salaries paid to the consuls of the United States, and the principle of leasing our consulate buildings, as compared with the salaries of the Consuls of other countries and the tenure by which their consulate buildings are held. The salaried officers of the Consulate-General of the United States at Shanghai are: The Consul-General, $5,000; Vice and Deputy Consul-General, one office with no salary, though the incumbent generally receives the $1,600 allowed the Consulate-General for a clerk; interpreter, $1,500; marshall, $1,000, and jailer, $500—the salaries for the Consulate-General proper amounting in all to $9,600. As the consular system of Great Britain is the system to which ours is most nearly kindred, and as the foreign commerce of Great Britain is larger in tonnage and value than that of any other nation in the world, I will take the British system for a standard of comparison.

The salary of the Consul-General of Great Britain is $10,000, with $500 as Registrar of British shipping; Consul, $6,000; Vice-Consul, $3,500, with allowance, as assessor to the Mixed Court, of an additional $1,000; another Vice-Consul, at $3,250; Crown Advocate, $2,500, and Chief Clerk, $2,250. We must also include the salaries paid several student interpreters and under clerks, all of which would make the expenditures about $40,000, or, in round numbers, $30,000 more than the government of the United States expends upon its Consulate-General at the great commercial centre of Asia.

The comparison may be extended to the tenure by which the buildings of the Consulate-General of these two governments are held. The grounds for the British Consulate-General cover about three acres, beautifully laid out, and enclosed by a brick wall over five feet high. Within the enclosure are three large brick buildings, each two stories high, with neat and massive appearance. The centre building is for the offices, in which all business pertaining to the Consulate-General is transacted. One of the outer buildings is the residence of the Consul-General and his family, and the other is for the Consul and his family. Both are comfortably and substantially furnished by the government,

and supplied with necessary servants. To support the dignity of his position and extend the influence of his office, the British Consul-General is allowed a certain sum for entertaining. These grounds are in the most desirable part of the city of Shanghai. The buildings front the harbor, and the British flag can be seen from every ship that enters the harbor, as well as from any division of the city. The property is located on the British concession, and the government of Great Britain holds a fee simple tenure to it.

When George F. Seward was Consul-General of the United States at Shanghai, there were erected at his expense two buildings located on the American concession, suitable for offices and a residence for the Consul-General. For several years these buildings, desirably located, were leased by the government of the United States, year by year, for a Consulate-General. The rent paid for the lease averaged as much as $1,800 a year, a very reasonable price. It is believed that these buildings were used for consular purposes as many as fifteen years, which makes a total rentage price of $27,000. But as Shanghai prospered, rents began to rise. Under a law of Congress the Department of State could not authorize the Consul-General to pay more, and these most desirable and comfortable buildings, fronting the harbor and showing the Stars and Stripes to every merchant and traveller who entered it, and to all parts of the city, were bought by a Japanese steamship company for about $30,000. Six months from the date of the purchase the steamship company was offered $60,000 for the property, and to-day it would sell for $100,000. The need of a few hundred dollars to meet the advance in rent natural to a prosperous city forced the Consul-General in 1889 to move the Consulate-General. The correspondence on the subject shows that there was no suitable building for a Consulate-General on the American concession at the rent the Consul-General was authorized to pay, and, in consequence, the Stars and Stripes now float over a building owned by a British land investment company, located on a back street of the British concession, and cannot be seen from the harbor at all. If no other provision than the one now existing is made for the maintenance of a Consulate-General of the United States at Shanghai, increasing business at this port will force it off the foreign concession altogether.

There has never been any provision in American as in Brit-

ish law for the residence of consuls, and when the building of a consulate of the United States is large enough for the residence of a consul he is required to pay a part of the rent, a feature of our system that gives rise, in foreign countries, to much unfavorable comment. At Shanghai the building of our Consulate-General is only large enough for the offices, and the Consul-General must find a residence for himself and family, if he can. My home is on the American concession, where I intend to reside—the place where our Consulate-General should be; and Congress should enable the Department of State to build and own a home for the United States at this great business capital of Asia, and at other ports of the world where the Stars and Stripes are floated to advance American commerce and protect American citizens.

The diplomatic and consular service of the United States in China consists of a minister, $12,000; one secretary, $2,625; one secretary, $1,800; one interpreter, $3,000; one consul-general, $5,000; three consuls, $3,500 each, $10,500; three consuls, $3,000 each, $9,000; one consul, $2,500; one deputy consul-general, $1,600; six interpreters, $1,000 each, $6,000; one interpreter, $1,500; one interpreter, $600; four marshals, $1,000 each, $4,000; one marshal, $500; one marshal, $750. It thus appears that there are twenty-seven officers in the diplomatic and consular service of the United States in China at a cost, in salaries, of $61,375.

The salary of the British Minister at Peking is $32,500, being more than half of the entire salaries of the twenty-seven diplomatic and consular officers of the United States; and Great Britain expended in 1895 for her consular service alone in China the sum of $260,400, and has in this service sixty-four officers. Each British Consul in China receives $1,000 more as a salary than the salary of the Consul-General of the United States at Shanghai, and the British Consul-General at Shanghai $5,000 more, and each, in addition thereto, is provided with a residence free. The highest salary paid a Consul of the United States in China is $3,500, which is $2,500 less than Great Britain pays her lowest-salaried Consul, and our Consul must pay for his home or divide his salary with his government in paying the rent for one. Our Minister at Peking, Colonel Denby, is paid a salary of $12,000 a year, and is expected to reciprocate the courtesy and hospitality extended to him and his countrymen by Minis-

ters at the capital of China who receive a salary of $32,000 a year, with servants and carriage hire free.

It may be objected that I have not accurately stated the value of the emoluments of the Consul-General and Consuls of the United States in China; but I answer that the value of the fees received by these officers does not materially affect the principle I am presenting for consideration in the pages of a great review of my country. I am writing as an American citizen and presenting a principle overshadowing, in importance, mere details, and which appeals to the pride of an American citizen.

If it was wise to organize a consular service to promote the commerce of the United States, it is wise to maintain it so as to make it most efficient, a principle the soundness of which the British government has effectively recognized. It is not contended that a consular service is the only agency in the promotion of the foreign commerce of a country, for much depends upon the ability and energy of the merchants. But the value and tonnage of the foreign commerce of nations prove that the nations that best maintain their consular service share most largely in the value and tonnage of that commerce. The figures that I have given prove that in China the number in the diplomatic and consular service of Great Britain is twice as large as the number in the diplomatic and consular service of the United States, and that Great Britain expends on her consular service there $199,025 more than the United States. And the customs returns of China for 1895 show that the tonnage engaged in the carrying trade, foreign, and between the treaty ports, which is covered by the British flag, was 20,525,798 tons, and that of the United States 86,427, and the tonnage-carrying trade of the former is valued at $397,647,755, and that of the latter $1,525,636.

In personnel our Consuls do not suffer in comparison with the Consuls of other countries. The Consuls of the United States whom I know are generally men of business capacity and with the natural ability to qualify them for their official duties; but on other lines of comparison they are placed at a great disadvantage with their consular competitors, representing rival commercial nations. In addition to receiving twice as large a salary, the Consuls of these rival nations are provided with comfortable homes and encouraged to educate themselves in the duties of their office by a tenure which is not subject to the vacillating fortunes of political

parties. The economist who conceived the idea of aiding the Treasury of the United States by exacting from Consuls a part of their salary to assist the government in leasing respectable buildings for consulates may deserve credit for originality, but he could not have recommended a plan of economy which could have brought upon the consular system more unfavorable comment, and one more unjust to the consuls of his country.

At no period in the history of Oriental nations has it been more important to strengthen the official and commercial position of the United States in Asia than at present. The American citizen who comprehends the geographical position of his country, and measures, even in mental vision, its vast capabilities, cannot fail to see in the future, if not in the present, the need of new markets for our producers and merchants. However great the consumption at home, the extent of the industry of our people knows no standard in history by which to gauge the achievements of future results. In Asia there is already heard the sound of the retreating footsteps of a conservatism which has heretofore stood as an impenetrable barrier to all progress; and barbarians no longer threaten the gates of civilization. The world has witnessed what Japan has accomplished within a quarter of a century by changing a form of government that was destructive to every civilized aspiration for one which has liberated the mind of the Japanese people, and enabled them by merit to win a place in the parliament of nations. And the awakening of China need no longer be doubted. The treaty of Shimonoseki opened wider than ever the gates of China, and legalized the admission of new forces of civilization whose restless energy will not permit the empire to sleep again her wonted sleep.

The Emperor of China has recognized the spirit of the age by an edict that repeals all provisions in Chinese law invidious to religion and which permits the Christian church to buy and hold property in its own name, a step in advance which twelve months ago the most hopeful advocate of Chinese progress would have doubted, but a step from which there can be no receding, for the elevating influence of Christianity, when once experienced, has sustained and nerved its votaries through all trials. In the presence of the freedom of religious thought, a freer commerce—evidenced by the right to introduce, under the Shimonoseki treaty, machinery into China—and a more liberal political tendency, the

consequence thereof, the United States ought to occupy a conspicuous and influential position on the Asiatic stage.

A glance at the map of China shows the great extent of territorial area within the limits of the empire, all practically awaiting the development of modern industry; and the recent reverses of China in the field of war need not deter the prudent business man from undertaking the development of an empire whose internal wealth may, with probable safety, be compared in proportion to the vast extent of its territory.

It is known in all money markets that China has been prompt to discharge her pecuniary obligations, and that the merchant class of China stand high for probity. In dealing direct with the government or with the business class there is not a line or word in any treatise on the finance or credit of nations that reflects upon the uniform uprightness in business of either, and it is this fact that has caused the credit of China to be so readily acknowledged at money centres when she appeared as a borrower.

The total liabilities of China, arising out of the expenditure and penalties of the recent war with Japan, may be estimated in round numbers at $240,000,000, an obligation which, with a proper administration of the revenue, it would not be difficult to discharge. Under the able administration of Sir Robert Hart, the head of the Maritime Customs of China, the revenue, which has been the basis of present credit in borrowing in foreign markets to meet the penalties of the war, would be a small sum compared with what might be paid into the Treasury in Peking if the internal revenues were collected and accounted for under regulations different from those now in force. The reserve financial power of China, fully recognized by those who, in studying the subject, have looked below the surface, is the guarantee of the safety of investments for the development of China's internal resources. Herr von Brandt, a former German Minister to China, and one of the best authorities, thus subdivides the annual revenue of the central government:

Land tax	$28,877,888
Maritime customs	18,976,897
Inland transit dues	9,900,990
Native customs	8,250,825
Salt monopoly	8,250,825
Sales of titles and brevet ranks	4,125,413
Rice tribute	2,475,247
License, etc	1,650,165
Total	$82,508,250

With a population of from three to four hundred millions, and natural resources apparently inexhaustible, $82,508,250 would seem the lightest of taxation, but the system under which even this sum is collected makes the collection trebly burdensome. Under a system more consonant with justice, the amount received into the Treasury of the central government might be trebled without a heavier burden upon the people.

The reader will better understand and appreciate the difference in collecting revenue, under Sir Robert Hart's administration of the Maritime Customs, and the system under the administration of native officials, when he learns, that in the Canton province, the four ports where customs are collected under Sir Robert Hart's system, the revenue amounted to $3,300,330, while at the forty ports, where it is collected under the native system, the amount is less than $412,541.

The prudence of China in contracting obligations and her promptness in discharging them would seem to justify the prediction that when she fully awakens, the conservatism in Chinese character, which has retarded progress in China, will prove the balance wheel to steady the empire on its new path of progress. What the foreign trade of China will be, after feeling the influence of a new reformation, may be approximated by considering the increased value of Japan's trade, since the reformation of that empire. Ten years ago the entire foreign trade of Japan amounted to about $65,500,000, and in 1894 it exceeded $230,000,000, an increase of about three and a half fold. During the same decade the foreign trade of China only increased from $230,000,000 to $435,000,000. Another interesting fact, evidencing the growth of commerce, under the influence of a higher civilization, is that Japan, with forty millions of inhabitants, grades to-day where China, with nearly ten times the population, graded ten years ago. And the difference in the percentage of increase of foreign imports, during that decade, between Japan and China, is more favorable still to the former. In 1885 the import trade of Japan was valued at $28,000,000, and in 1894 at $117,000,000, an increase of over 300 per cent., while in 1885 the import trade of China was valued at $132,000,000, and in 1894 at $243,000,000, an increase of about 80 per cent. These comparisons are made to foreshadow the value of China's commercial future when she arrays herself in the garb of a new civilization.

If the demand of the forty million inhabitants of Japan for foreign goods nearly equals half the demand of the three or four hundred million inhabitants of China for such goods, then, on the basis of the present trade of Japan and the relative population of the two countries, the foreign trade of China, when China is developed to the extent of Japan, could be estimated at $1,000,000,000. And that this estimate is within limit, and its realization practicable, the following reason is given by a writer whose thoroughness and clearness in writing on the Oriental question entitles his opinion to weighty consideration. "China is endowed beyond Japan with natural resources which favor the growth of national wealth and the development of national industries. She grows her own cotton, while Japan has to import it; she grows silk of a better quality, and might increase the production to almost any extent; the same may be said of her teas. She is beginning to export wool, in spite of the well-known prohibitive cost of transport, over impassable roads, from the frontier of Mongolia to the coast; the cultivation of sugar and tobacco is capable of enormous development and improvement; in fact, there is hardly any valuable crop which cannot be successfully grown in one or other region of her vast and fertile soil, nor is there apparently a single mineral or precious metal which does not lie buried under the surface—gold, silver, and iron, and immense coal-fields, of quality unrivalled." Labor in China is as inexhaustible as the natural resources described, and as cheap as in any country; and it is the opinion of the managers of the cotton mills, now in operation at Shanghai, that in regard to mechanical skill the native hands, whether men, women, or children, compare favorably with the mill hands of England and the United States, and are more quickly trained and more easily managed. When China is developed, what will prevent her being as colossal in influence as she is in size and natural resources?

THOMAS R. JERNIGAN.

EDUCATIONAL USES OF HYPNOTISM.

BY DR. R. OSGOOD MASON.

It can no longer be doubted by those who are conversant with the subject that hypnotism is a fact and has come to stay. Its phenomena are too abundant and too easily observed; it has already proved of too great utility, and too many well-known scientific men have pronounced in its favor and are busy working out its numerous problems, to admit of its experiencing any serious decline or permanent retrograde movement.

In its domain two immense fields of investigation are already open and are assiduously cultivated: one is the field of therapeutics—the amelioration and cure of diseased conditions; the other is the field of psychology—the relation which hypnotism bears to mental action and the clews which it gives to strange and important phenomena which have long been misunderstood or else altogether ignored. In both of these fields much good work has already been done, while much still remains to be accomplished. But a third field is beginning to be opened up—still broader, and one which may yet prove of greater interest and utility than either of the others; it is the educational field—the influence which may be exerted by hypnotism upon the development and improvement of mind. How far it may be applicable to the development of the normal intellect it is not necessary now to inquire—the needs in that direction are not imperative; but when one views the number of children brought into the world with imperfect mental organizations and vicious tendencies, and sees how little impression in general is made upon them by the ordinary and even the special processes of education, it is of interest to inquire if there are no other methods by which these deficiencies may in a measure be remedied and the vicious tendencies eradicated.

Enough is already known of hypnotism generally to warrant us in looking with confidence in that direction for efficient and practical help; and experiment has shown that our expectations are not likely to be disappointed. What are the facts and methods now ready for inspection?

Both of the important fields with which we are already acquainted, the therapeutic and psychic, present obvious analogies to the comparatively new one now under consideration. When hypnotism, under the name of animal magnetism, was brought to light a hundred years ago, the main feature presented was its curative influence upon disease; and, while its curious psychological phenomena were studiously noted, the main object of those who so energetically, and in the face of ignorant and discourteous opposition, pursued its study during the first half-century was to find the best methods of making it practically useful as a therapeutic agent. All these early experimenters produced the hypnotic condition by means of passes and manipulations, and had no doubt but that some influence or virtue passed from the operator to the subject, by which he was put to sleep and by which also curative effects were produced.

Half a century later, midway in the history of the subject, Braid began to produce hypnotic effects by other means than those used by the early mesmerists, and to throw doubt upon the theory of a magnetic influence; and, while he introduced a new name, new procedures, and, to a greater extent, the psychic element, he did not increase the practical curative effects which had hitherto been the main object of those who devoted themselves to the study and practice of the new art. Under the influence of Liébeault, Charcot, and Bernheim, the psychic element was still further recognized and emphasized, and suggestion was made the prominent feature in treatment; but it was still the therapeutic value of hypnotism which constituted the leading element and motive in its study, and it was in hospitals and the private practice of physicians that it was chiefly studied and made use of. So from its first appearance to the present time its therapeutic value has been recognized, and has constituted one of its leading features. Only second to this have been the psychic phenomena which have accompanied the hypnotic condition, and which have come to excite more and more interest and to assume greater and greater importance.

Of these psychic phenomena, that which most nearly concerns our present purpose is the increased power of suggestion, as shown by the facility with which the hypnotized subject may be influenced, and the wonderful effect, physical, mental, and moral, which suggestion properly applied in the hypnotic condition is able to produce.

As examples of the physical effects which it is possible to produce by suggestion, the following may be mentioned: The rate of the pulse may be increased or diminished; contraction or relaxation of certain muscles may be produced; paralysis of a specified limb may be caused, or it may be cured when it already exists; an ordinary postage stamp applied to the skin may produce a blister; a piece of cold metal, as, for instance, a key, applied to the skin, may produce a raised figure of the same shape, red from congestion of the capillary vessels, or it may be made to appear as a blister; red or bleeding points upon the hands or feet or side may be produced, all by suggestion alone or a touch accompanied by suggestion. Such are some of the physical effects which may in some specially susceptible patients be produced by suggestion while in the hypnotic condition.

If such physical effects are possible, it may easily be believed that mental and moral effects may also be induced—and such is the fact. Here, then, we come directly upon the boundaries of our present subject, namely, the educational element in hypnotism; for, if mental and moral effects in the direction of improvement can be produced and made permanent, we have taken a long step in a true educational process.

To what extent has this been actually accomplished?

A very marked and, it must also be said, most unusual case is reported in the *Annales Medico-Psychologiques*, and has been verified and summarized by Mr. F. W. H. Myers, Secretary of the Society for Psychical Research.

Still further condensed, it is as follows. In the summer of 1884 there was at the Salpêtrière a young woman of a deplorable type—a criminal lunatic, filthy in habits and violent in demeanor, and with a life-long history of impurity and theft. M. Auguste Voisin, one of the physicians of the hospital staff, undertook to hypnotize her at a time when she could be kept quiet only by the strait-jacket and the continuous cold douche to the head. She would not look at the operator, but raved and spat at him.

M. Voisin, however, kept his face close to hers and followed her eyes wherever she moved them. In ten minutes she was asleep, and in five minutes more she passed into the sleep-waking or somnambulic state and began to talk incoherently. This treatment being repeated on many successive days, she gradually became sane when in the hypnotic condition, though she still raved when awake.

At length she came to obey in her waking hours commands impressed upon her in her trance—trivial matters, such as to sweep her room—then suggestions involving marked changes in her behavior; finally in the hypnotic state she voluntarily expressed regret for her past life, and of her own accord made good resolutions for the future which she carried out when awake; and the improvement in her conduct and character was permanent. Two years later M. Voisin wrote that she was a nurse in a Paris hospital and that her conduct was irreproachable.

This is an unusual but by no means a unique case. M. Voisin has reported others equally striking; and M. Dufour, medical director of another asylum, has also found hypnotism "able to render important service in the treatment of mental disease," and has adopted it as a regular and important factor in its cure.

I mention these cases not as being the most practical in character, but as showing the power for good of hypnotic treatment in some cases of a most unpromising class. The class to which I would especially call attention is the one embracing mental deficiencies, evil habits, and vicious tendencies, exhibited especially in childhood and youth. Under the head of mental deficiencies may be mentioned dullness of perception, imperfect power of attention, deficient memory, and general inaptitude for acquiring knowledge; under evil habits may be mentioned personal uncleanliness, biting the nails, idleness, cowardice, the tobacco, opium, or alcohol habit; and under vicious tendencies, lying, unconscious misrepresentation, kleptomania, needless cruelty, and moral perversity.

At the Second International Congress of Experimental Psychology, held in London in 1892, a paper was read by Dr. Bérillon, editor of the *Revue de l'Hypnotisme*, entitled "The Application of Hypnotic Suggestion to Education." Under his observation hypnotism and suggestion had been successfully utilized in the treatment of more than 250 children with refer-

ence to the following diseases and tendencies: nervous insomnia, night terror, somnambulism, kleptomania, stammering, inveterate idleness, uncleanliness, cowardice, biting the nails, and moral perversity. He stated further that facts relative to the successful treatment of these diseases by suggestion had been verified by a great number of observers and authors, and that such facts constituted the practical side of psychology. Suggestion made it possible to submit the development of the various intellectual faculties of the child to a careful analysis, and thus to facilitate the process of education.

A most important fact, and one which renders the use of suggestion of much wider application than has usually been thought possible, is, that in order to accomplish the proposed object it is not necessary that the deep hypnotic sleep should be produced. Many persons consulting a physician for hypnotic treatment suppose it necessary that they should go into the deep trance and pass through all the wonderful stages and experiences which occasionally accompany this condition; associated with this supposition is also the idea that some miraculous change or therapeutic effect is to be suddenly produced; and, while it is true that such sudden and seemingly miraculous effects are sometimes produced, yet in the aggregate ten times more good is accomplished by the slower process of repeated suggestion upon cases in which the hypnotic condition is only partially secured, and in which neither absolute unconsciousness nor absolute anæsthesia accompanies the processes employed; and this is the use of hypnotic suggestion to which I would especially apply the term *educational*.

What part, then, does hypnotism bear in this matter, and how can its use be made an adjuvant to education?

In the study of the more unusual phenomena connected with mental action, some interesting facts have been discovered; and one of these facts is this, that the personality which we ordinarily see in activity, that which observes, talks, is intensely occupied about money, society, office, food, and general comfort, that personality by which we are usually known, may not after all be the only one which goes to make up the individual, but that another personality may sometimes make its appearance. Some persons, as, for instance, those known as somnambulists, while in a condition apparently of ordinary sleep, arise from their beds, walk, talk, play an instrument, write sermons and prepare argu-

ments, then return to bed, sleep on as usual, awake at the proper time and know nothing of what has transpired during their somnambulism. These persons are utterly unconscious of what has transpired, nevertheless they often do things much better than when awake, and even things which they could not accomplish at all in their ordinary condition. Still further, although in their waking condition they are quite unconscious of what has transpired during their somnambulism, yet when a similar condition occurs upon a subsequent night, all the events which occurred on the former occasion are perfectly remembered and talked about, so that the several occasions upon which this somnambulic condition has occurred and the events which transpired in them are all linked together, forming one well-defined chain of memories and a personality perfectly distinct from the usual one.

When a somnambulist is put into the hypnotic condition and then talks, it is found that the speaker is that same personality which spoke and acted during the time of ordinary somnambulism, showing that the personality which acts during ordinary somnambulism and the personality brought into action by hypnotism are the same. This new personality has of late become a subject of great interest and persistent study. Not only does it come into activity in ordinary somnambulism and in the hypnotic condition, but also in dreams, in reverie, in abstraction, and sometimes apparently in a normal passive condition. This second personality has been named the sub-conscious or subliminal self, and it possesses many curious faculties which we have not time to consider here; but, whatever this subliminal self may be, we have in hypnotism the means of experimentally reaching and influencing it; and this is where the great power of suggestion appears and is utilized.

Suppose, then, the physician has a patient in the deep hypnotic sleep; the patient hears nothing, perhaps feels nothing. The physician then says to him: "When you awake you will take the book which lies on the table, open it at the forty-third page and read four lines at the top of the page." He is then awakened. He has heard nothing; but his subliminal self, which has been made accessible by hypnotism, has heard and influences him to carry out the suggestion. He goes to the table and takes up the book, finds the forty-third page and he reads the four lines at the top of the page; he has no thought but that he is doing it all of his

own accord ; and so he is—he is obeying the impulse of his own subliminal self.

Suppose the patient to be a boy with the cigarette habit, and the physician had suggested as follows : " When you awake you will no longer desire to smoke. On the contrary, the very thought of it will be disagreeable to you, and you will avoid it altogether." He awakes, he knows nothing of what has transpired, but he finds he has no longer the desire to smoke, and consequently he ceases the practice.

Suppose, on the contrary, this had been the suggestion : " You know your parents are greatly troubled and anxious about your smoking ; you are too young ; it will be harmful to you. When you awake this idea will be constantly before you, and it will so influence your action that in compliance with the wishes of your parents, and because you will be convinced of its harmful effects, you will at once leave off the habit." And so he does.

But perhaps only one in ten of those applying for treatment are good hypnotic subjects and can be influenced in this comparatively easy manner. What of the other nine—can they have no assistance ? On the contrary, nearly every one of them can be brought into the hypnotic condition to a greater or less degree—usually into a condition of reverie or light sleep, in which the usual self is passive and the subliminal self may be more or less perfectly reached and influenced. These are the more difficult cases—less striking and less satisfactory to both patient and physician ; nevertheless, they are cases in which perseverance can accomplish a great deal, and is almost sure of achieving success.

Putting the patient into the best hypnotic condition possible, the suggestions are quietly and earnestly made and repeated ; he is then aroused ; he has been quieted and peculiarly rested ; he thinks he has heard what has been said to him, but very likely he is unable to repeat it. The treatment is repeated at short intervals for a few days or weeks, and all concerned are gratified to find the desired result secured. It is in this manner, by frequent repetition, that the educational effect of hypnotic suggestion is obtained, whether in the deep sleep or light hypnotic condition. An imperfect memory to be stimulated, a kleptomaniac to be restrained, or a case of habitual lying to be influenced, and a mental force and moral sentiment induced, these are matters requiring tact, labor, and patience; but much can be accomplished.

An intellectual perception, and a moral sentiment, are at length established where precept and punishment under ordinary conditions had proved of no avail.

Numerous examples could be cited, not only of these moral deformities and deficiencies remedied, but also in the line of ordinary education, where there was absolute inability to concentrate the mind upon the given task, or where every idea regarding it vanished, leaving the mind a blank, the moment the pupil stood up in the class-room, or where memory entirely failed to retain the acquired lesson; or, still again, where even in adults the ability to spell correctly or use grammatical language was wanting; and where a few hypnotic treatments by suggestion have given the power to concentrate the mind upon study—to retain and express clearly what was learned—and where, by the same means, a good degree of facility in spelling and the correct use of language has been acquired.

Such is a mere hint of the possibilities connected with the use of hypnotic suggestion as an element in education. My own experience in many interesting cases, as well as the recorded observation of others, has led me to believe that these possibilities have yet only begun to be appreciated or their value and wide range of application suspected, and that the next half century will see newer, truer, more harmonious as well as more scientific views regarding hypnotism itself among those who make it a study; that the prejudice on the part of the public, which is now a bar to its usefulness, will disappear; and that new uses, therapeutic, psychic, and educational, will be discovered, which will place it among the most highly prized agents for good in use among intelligent well-wishers of humanity.

R. Osgood Mason.

IF SILVER WINS.

BY LOUIS WINDMÜLLER, AND THE HON. WALTER CLARK, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA.

I. THE SHRINKAGE OF WAGES.

A GENIAL "popocratic" poet divided mankind into three classes: "Some have much—they are apt to get a great deal more; others have little, which will be taken from them; the rest, having nothing, should retire from the world because they have no claim on life."

It is plain to the impartial observer that the middle and lower classes are suffering, and can enjoy no longer many of the comforts of life. To talk to them of prosperity is worse than useless, because it does not exist for them. A portion of their number have been led by interested parties to believe that their condition would improve if silver were adopted as the standard measure of values. Calling such men repudiators may irritate, but will not convince them that they are mistaken. That measure can benefit some of the rich, but would injure the poorer classes.

The very meaning of the word "money" is misunderstood, especially by those who have none and want a great deal; they appreciate its power, but have not discovered how it originated. Coins containing a certain quantity of precious metal are used to measure the value of other commodities; the stamp they bear is a certificate, issued by the authorities, that they have tested that value and found it correct. Whenever, in years gone by, a government has stamped coins for more than they were worth, the workmen were obliged to take them for their face value, and came to grief because they could not purchase as much food with them as with honest coin. The present craze is partially explained by ignorant greed; white and colored delegates

are reported to have said in St. Louis that they expected from Mr. Bryan a free distribution of the silver in the Treasury!

In 1792, when we began to mint money, the value of our silver dollar was equal to a gold dollar, and 15½ grains of silver were worth as much as one grain of gold; this proportion continued to exist with slight variations until 1865. The production of both precious metals has increased since then, but the increase in the production of silver has been greatest. Of the quantity of both precious metals which the world has annually brought forth the proportion was:

85 per cent. of silver against 15 per cent. of gold from 1861 to 1865, against
95 " " " " " 5 " " " " " 1890 " 1895.

With the increase of production came a decline of value and fluctuations which made silver less desirable for measuring the values of other commodities. Here is an illustration. The yellow metal contained in a gold eagle, when melted, will buy as much merchandise as the ten-dollar piece itself, and will be accepted as a valid payment for that amount in any part of the world.

The white metal obtained when ten of our standard silver dollars are melted will only pass for $5.30 to-day, and may not be worth over $4.50 to-morrow, which was all such a lump brought only recently.

Standard silver dollars were made legal tenders in 1878, and will practically remain interchangeable with gold, as all the various kinds of our paper money are, for their face value, as long as the government continues gold payments, and is enabled to do so by an adequate gold reserve. The platform recently adopted by Democratic and Populistic delegates requires the passage of a law which compels the coinage of all silver presented at the mint into legal-tender dollars at the rate of 16 grains of silver to one of gold, although it really takes 30 grains now to buy one grain of gold. The consequence will be that the actual value of the standard silver dollar must gradually decline to 53 cents, because the mints will be required to coin so many of them that their parity with gold can no longer be maintained. The advocates of this measure pretend to believe that the United States can thereby raise the value of 53 cents' worth of silver to the value of a dollar by a stamp of the mint; they could as well pass a law to make our wives accept six eggs for a dozen, or eighteen inches of calico for a yard. A thousand years ago Canute, King of England,

became annoyed at his courtiers who wanted to flatter by telling him he was almighty; he took them to the beach when the tide was rising, and commanded the waves to respect his body while resting there, but the ocean rose and compelled him to retire as if he had been an ordinary mortal. Seventy millions of sovereigns are as powerless against the laws of nature as Canute was alone. When the government is obliged to redeem its promises in depreciated silver and to suspend gold payments, the banks will have to follow; gold will be worth a premium and commodities will rise in proportion—especially products that can be exported and for which we can draw gold from Europe; and goods that we import, for which we must send gold to Europe.

Labor will remain nominally unchanged, but must actually depreciate because the same wages will not buy as much food and clothing. When the United States issued irredeemable paper money for the expenses of our Civil War in 1861, gold rose to a premium and prices of merchandise followed, until in 1864 the average premium on gold was over 100 per cent., and prices of merchandise had more than doubled; but it took years before wages began to rise. A friend of mine, a clerk in a mercantile house, who earned $1,000 in the year 1859, received $1,400 in 1865; what he was able to purchase in 1859 for $1,000 would have cost him $2,200 in 1865. He was obliged to economize accordingly.

I concede that many hired men have cause for complaining; but cheaper money could not better their condition, because it would diminish instead of increasing their remuneration.

The capital of the laborer and professional man is the wages he earns by the sweat of his brow, or the exertion of his brain; he gets for his work no more than he is entitled to. Why should he join a strike to lower his compensation by reducing the value of the dollar in which he will be paid?

When Thomas Jefferson established, in 1792, the ratio of 15½ grains of silver to one grain of gold, he accepted the relative values of the two metals as acknowledged by nations with whom we had commercial intercourse. Although these same nations will only accept thirty grains of silver for every grain of gold we owe, silverites insist they would have to take them at the rate which was valid a century ago if we passed a law to re-establish that value. In 1792, the gold value of a bushel of wheat was one dol-

lar, of corn fifty cents; if we were as powerful as friends of silver claim, and could compel England to pay these prices of 1792 in gold to-day, our farmers would cease to grumble.

Twenty-five million people, about a third of our population, live by agriculture; a small portion have large tracts of land and ample means for their cultivation; they employ skilled labor, use expensive fertilizers and the most improved machinery, all of which enables them to make some money at present low prices. But a majority of farmers eke out a bare living by raising the same crops on small plots of ground, losing money one season after another, until all is gone. Some are remote from the market, so that the prices they get hardly pay for the labor of hauling, and little, if anything, is left for the tiller of the soil himself. But is he not to blame for the hard lot he continues to endure? When a merchant or manufacturer finds an article does not pay, he turns his attention to something else. I know manufacturers of sewing machines and furniture springs who prospered because they made bicycles when these began to be called for. Why should farmers not follow this example? There is an over-production of wheat, but a good demand for sugar-beets at renumerative prices; these can be raised in almost every part of the country. If a few neighbors were to combine, they could find means for a suitable apparatus to put up vegetables in cans, which is a paying business. Poultry is in demand, and can be preserved when distance to the market makes it desirable; money is made on the Pacific Coast by raising and drying fruit, which is sent to consumers throughout the world. A thorough study of agriculture would benefit the farmer; no bread-winner can expect to succeed in this progressive age without a complete knowledge of the requirements of his vocation.

A nominal increase in prices of the products which the poor farmer raises would not bring the prosperity he looks for if payment were made in debased currency.

He would have to pay twice as much for everything he has to purchase.

The carriers who bring his wheat to the East would increase prices for transportation, as their debts are payable in gold, and their material would be more expensive.

His taxes would be higher because it would cost more to build schoolhouses and roads.

He can gain nothing by a depreciation in the cost of labor, because his work is done by himself and his family.

The person who owes $2,500 on a farm valued at $5,000 wants the privilege of paying his debt in silver dollars when they become depreciated by free coinage; he claims this as a right because twenty-five hundred bushels of wheat were worth $2,500 in either gold or silver when he incurred the debt.* But wheat is not now, and never has been, a measure to judge values by; it fluctuates, and is too bulky. Silver has become unsuitable for similar reasons. A thousand dollars in gold weighs $3\frac{68}{100}$ pounds, a thousand dollars' worth of silver at 30 to 1 weighs $110\frac{4}{10}$ pounds, a thousand dollars' worth of wheat at 60 cents a bushel weighs one hundred thousand pounds. The claim, so often made, that gold has appreciated while silver has remained stationary, cannot be sustained by a comparison with the articles which have declined, because their production has also increased.

If the debtor means to be just, he will consider that the creditor's money was equal to $2,500, gold, when he trusted him. To force depreciated money upon him in discharge of the loan would be wrong, and, in most cases, impracticable. Where could the debtor get the silver before the debt becomes due? More than one-half of all mortgages are overdue already and will be renewed only on condition that payment in gold is promised. The debt of $2,500 would then grow into one for $5,000, without a corresponding increase in the value of the farm.

While the interest on money is from one-half to three per cent. in England, it is four to ten per cent. in this country, simply because lenders are sure they will be repaid in the same kind of money in England; the rate of interest varies according to the risk incurred by the lender, the greatest of which is a shrinkage in the value of his principal.

The classes who have their savings in banks or life insurance companies would lose one-half of their investments, because these institutions could pay no longer in gold. The accumulations of millions of thrifty laborers, of their widows and orphans, would be cut in two. Pensions and salaries would decrease in the same proportion.

* I quote from a Western paper: "Owners of mortgaged farms seem to think it is against their principle to pay the interest, and against their interest to pay the principal."

There are three classes who would gain :

(1.) Owners and miners of silver who can get it converted into fifty-cent dollars and pass these for almost their face value before they depreciate.*

(2.) Brokers would make money for themselves and their speculative customers, as they did during the war, by fluctuations in the premiums on gold, foreign exchanges, and certain commodities.

(3.) Exporters of manufactures could pay their help in depreciated money, and sell the goods in foreign countries for gold. Wages paid in Japan, the most powerful of the few nations who yet cling to silver, average forty cents a day for skilled labor, enabling Japanese manufacturers to compete with the English in their own colonies.

When our public debt was created principal and interest were made payable in coin ; gold coin was worth as much at that time as silver coin. For this reason, and because gold was required in payment for most of them, the holders of our bonds are justified when they expect to be paid in the same value ; an attempt to pay them in depreciated silver would be an act of open repudiation in the eyes of God and the world.

Almost the entire civilized world has adopted gold since 1871, because its own value fluctuates less than that of any other commodity. It has superseded silver as standard of values for reasons similar to those which made us abandon stages for steam and electricity, as motors, or pickaxes and shovels for modern implements, as cultivators. Our financial strength is not inferior to that of other nations ; to remain behind them in not adopting the best metal for our circulating medium would indicate a lack of appreciation of our own interest. The stagnation which has prevailed here for years is due more to uncertainty than to other causes ; when we legalize payment of principal and interest of our bonds in gold, confidence in our integrity will return ; capital will be reinvested ; industries will revive ; and every skilful laborer will be employed.

* The Bland act of 1878, and the Sherman law of 1890, which compelled the government to buy silver, caused the white metal first to rise; then the production was stimulated so that it declined to a lower price than it had been at. Both measures have done more harm to the nation than good to miners. The present attempt, if successful, would have similar effects. The poor people, who constitute a majority of the Democratic party, ought to have the sense to see that their votes might reduce their scanty earnings, without conferring a lasting benefit even on miners, who want to persuade them to this folly for their own temporary advantage.

Hoarding of money and financial disturbances already foreshadow what we would have to expect from their madness if the advocates of free silver should succeed—ruin and general bankruptcy. Then it would become terribly clear to the masses that they were inveigled against classes by false representations ; then the wealth of all their mines could not save the silver barons from popular indignation.

Some are reckless enough to say that it can do them no harm in their present condition to try free coinage a while ; let them remember the words of a certain patriot uttered against a measure detrimental to public welfare, which was proposed in the British Parliament : "Mr. Speaker, there is a lion in the lobby; shall we open the doors to him ?"

LOUIS WINDMÜLLER.

II. INEVITABLE CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES.

THE Stamp Act was the occasion of the Revolutionary struggle, but the full breadth of the question to be settled was whether the Colonies should be governed by themselves or by England. So, in the struggle which is engaging the attention of the country this year, the gold standard and the financial question generally is the exciting occasion ; but the real issue is far more comprehensive, and is in truth whether the governing power shall abide with consolidated capital in its various shapes, or whether it shall be transferred to the people at large. As the issue is sometimes tersely expressed, it is a contest between the masses and the classes. If the former win, the victors, as in all such contests, will demand guarantees ; and, according to the utterances of the leaders, those guarantees will be imbedded in the Constitution as amendments. After the Civil War its results were thus safeguarded by being incorporated as amendments in the organic law.

An American minister to Russia, while walking one day in the palace grounds with the Czar, observed a sentinel in the centre of a grass plot. To his practical mind there was no need of a sentinel at that place, and with American freedom he asked the cause. It had never before occurred to the Czar to consider the cause, but it struck him on reflection as singular, and he inquired of the Chief of Staff. He in turn could not answer and consulted his subordinates ; they knew nothing except that there had always been a sentinel posted at that place. The archives

were consulted, but threw no light on the matter. Finally, a very old lackey was found who remembered that his father, also a palace *attaché*, had told him long years before that an old soldier had told him that in the soldier's youth the Empress Catherine had one day found a flower at that spot and had caused a soldier to be posted there to guard it from being plucked; no orders had subsequently come for his removal, and so for more than one hundred and fifty years, without question or inquiry, a soldier of the Russian Imperial Guard had been posted at that spot.

There are many things in the common law, as it has been handed down to us, which have had no better reason for their origin or their long continuance. Some judge, in ill humor, or sick, or overworked, or in a haste to get off to his pleasures, or possibly prejudiced against a party, or boozy (and such have been kenned) has made a decision; another judge followed the precedent, and then another, till it stiffened into the law of the realm and became praised as part of a system, which those who profited by exploiting its mysteries styled the "perfection of reason." To a lesser extent the same is true of our federal Constitution. Features were adopted, such as the election of senators by the State legislatures, merely because it happened to be the custom of the day to elect governors by those bodies; or the appointment of judges by the Executive for the same reason, though both these matters have long since been changed in the several State constitutions. Other provisions were inserted because they were natural in the environment of a hundred years ago; others because the Constitution was planned for a comparatively poor people of three millions, and without anticipation of the enormous growth since in civilization, wealth, and population, and in the power of corporations; other features still were inserted by compromise, and some almost by accident. The Constitution has become in many respects a misfit, notwithstanding its modification by fifteen amendments. It is very certain that if the Constitution were to be made at this time, in the light of the present conditions and with the knowledge of the dangers now to be feared, it would be materially different from the instrument adopted at Philadelphia in September, 1787.

The men who made the Constitution were aware that experience and development would require changes, and they provided for their being made either by a general convention of the

States on the application of two-thirds of the legislatures, or by a two-thirds vote of both Houses, subject to approval by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. It is well that amendments are not easily made, but the action of the several States in amending their own State constitutions has shown the necessity of amendment, due to our development and changed conditions, and the results of our experience. This applies to the federal Constitution no less than to the State constitutions, and there are many changes which have been considered in the public mind whose adoption into the federal instrument will not be much longer postponed if the opposition to the gold standard shall carry the country.

Among those which the victors will most earnestly insist upon are the following :

1. *The Election of United States Senators by the People.*—This would not change in any wise the representation and equality of the States in the Senate, but provides for the change in the mode of electing the two Senators of each state by the people thereof, instead of by its legislature. The force of corporate wealth is much more easily brought to bear upon the limited number of men composing a State legislature than upon the people at large. Hence a change to the broader constituency will be a distinct gain for the masses. It will be a guarantee that corporate power will lose a large number of seats in the Senate, which it has, heretofore, filled or controlled. This proposed amendment has already three times passed the lower House of Congress, but has hitherto found its grave in the Senate itself, too many of whose members felt that the proposed change would destroy their own chances of re-election.

2. *The Election of all United States Judges by the People.*—On the same line and for the same reason the federal judges must be made elective and for a term of years. When the federal Constitution was adopted in none of the States were the judges elected by the people, and it would therefore have been strange if they had been made so in that instrument. Now, in nearly every State the judges have been made elective by the people, and it is strange that the federal judges should not be made elective in the same mode. Indeed, for stronger reasons than have caused the States to make their judges elective, should the same change be adopted as to the federal judges. Many of them ap-

pointed by corporate influences and all holding their positions for life, and thrown in constant contact with the courtesies extended to them by the wealthier classes, the federal judges are under no obligations to the people and under every obligation to the classes. While there are honorable exceptions, it is known to all men that the federal bench is the stronghold of the money power. That power may be dislodged from the House and Senate, even from the presidency, but the care it has shown in procuring the appointment of judges, naturally biased by their experience as corporation lawyers, or by the influence exerted for their appointment, and the life tenure of their offices, secure the money power in its intrenchments in the judiciary. The power that branch of the government claims in increasing extent to nullify acts of the other two branches of government is making it essential that the masses shall obtain a guarantee of their victory by making this branch of the government dependent upon their sovereignty. The "government by injunction," and the late reversal of one hundred years' unbroken decisions to secure exemption from taxation to the millionaire element, have rudely broken public confidence in the federal judiciary and necessitate its reconstitution on modern lines by making the tenure of judicial office for a term instead of for life, and the office itself elective instead of appointive. Without this change in a body of men who claim the power to abrogate legislative acts and to restrain executive action, any popular triumph at the polls would be illusory.

District and circuit judges could be elected by the people of their respective districts and circuits as and when members of Congress are elected, for a term, say, of eight or twelve years. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court should be elected in the same manner as the President, but the Union should be divided by law into the same number of divisions as there are associate judges of the Supreme Court, and one judge chosen by each division, but in such a manner that only a part of the seats should be filled at any one election. No objection can can be made to the election of federal judges by the people, which would not apply with the same force to that mode of selecting State judges—a method which has been almost universally adopted. And seeing that the matters affecting the interests of consolidated wealth are brought almost entirely into the federal courts, there are stronger reasons why their influence in

the selection of the judges, which is now overshadowing, should be minimized by a resort to election by the people.

3. *The Election of Postmasters.*—The territory adjacent to each post-office should be divided into circumscriptions, and a postmaster chosen every four or six years by the voters thereof at the same time and in the same manner as the members of Congress. This would reduce largely the evils of the patronage system and would modify also the heat and violence of a Presidential election. The post-offices would not be dependent upon the general result, for while the country at large might go for either party the particular locality would secure its local choice. Indeed, in perhaps the majority of cases the election of postmaster would be decided by questions of fitness and personal preference of the patrons of the office, and not upon party lines. It would modify the centralization tendencies of the post-office, and would thereby remove the strongest objection to modernizing the post-office by adding the telegraph and telephone services, which are properly part of an efficient postal service, and as such have been added to it in all other countries than ours. The election of postmasters for a fixed term is preferable to the civil-service life tenure. The clerks and all other subordinates in the postal service should be appointed under civil-service rules. The postmasters would still give bond and would be subject to regulation and removal for cause as they are now.

4. *The Presidential Term.*—For reasons which are too well known to require fuller discussion, the President should be ineligible for re-election, and for this purpose his single term should be fixed at six years, so as to minimize, as far as safe to do so, the shocks incident to a presidential election. As half our Presidents have served two terms and half of them one term, six years each has been the average service in the past (counting the Vice-Presidents succeeding by casualty as simply a continuance of the presidency of their chief). Mr. Cleveland when elected the first time and Mr. Bryan recently are among those who have declared in favor of the one-term principle.

5. *The Veto Power.*—The veto power is an anachronism and has no proper place in our system, in which each of the three great departments of government should be separate and distinct. In England no monarch has dared to use the veto since the revolution of 1688, more than two centuries. It is a power-

ful lever in the hands of a party President to nullify any change in, or expression of, the will of the people, however plainly expressed by the election of members of Congress in the middle of his term. It is un-republican and its retention implies a doubt of the power of the people to change their public policy, unless in the election year of a President.

6. *The Mode of Electing the President.*—There has been one change already made by the 12th amendment in the mode of electing the President, and there have been distinct pronouncements at times in favor of electing the President by a direct vote of the people. The suppression, effacement in fact, of the minority in each State under the present system, is an evil unquestionably, but the election of the President by a direct vote of the people will scarcely be adopted for two reasons. In the first place, to do so, would be to destroy the advantage now given all the smaller States by the addition of two votes in the electoral college to each State irrespective of size, in recognition of the fact that the President is chosen by the people and the States. The smaller States would vote against a change which would reduce their importance and thus aggrandize the weight of the larger States and the required three-fourths would not ratify. Again, frauds are most easily perpetrated in States having large majorities, but now the evil is minimized, for whether Georgia or Mississippi, or Iowa, or Minnesota gives 40,000 or 100,000 majority for a candidate, makes no difference, since the candidate, in either event, merely gets the electoral vote of the State. But on a vote of the whole people of the Union, as one district, a fraud at any one of the thousands of precincts in the Union becomes a matter of interest to every other precinct. This would give ground to contest every presidential election, and for the appointment of poll holders and the investigation and canvassing of the result at each poll by federal authority. Contested presidential elections would become the rule, and civil war over the result inevitable. A modified plan has been suggested which retains the benefits of each of the above systems. It is suggested that the present system of apportioning the number of votes to each State in accordance with the numbers of members of Congress and senators be retained, but that instead of the whole vote of the State being cast according to the majority in that State (as is the custom), or even by districts, as is allowable under the Constitution, since

that would lead to gerrymandering, the vote of the State be divided *pro rata*. Suppose a State with ten electoral votes casts 150,000 votes for A, 120,000 for B, and 30,000 for C. Instead of the ten electoral votes going to A, as under our present system, he would get five votes, B would get four, and C one vote. In case of fractions, the largest fraction would take the odd vote. This system avoids the evils of a more direct vote as above stated, and while retaining the two votes allotted to each State for its statehood, avoids the suppression of minorities incident to the present system.

7. There is a formulated demand by one great party that government control of railroads be made more efficient, and by another that the government shall own all the principal lines of railways, appointments to service therein to be made under civil service rules. It is very certain that under the present system governmental control, though held constitutional by the Supreme Court, is a sham. The manufacture of millionaires, by secret rates and other methods, goes right on with the coincidence of crushing out all small competitors and the impoverishment of the masses by high rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission seems powerless, and, as to the state railroad commissions, in too many instances, the railroads, through their lobbyists, have secured the election either of their tools, or of weak men, as commissioners, and in other States, as a railroad president cynically remarked, the railroads have simply "added the railroad commission to their assets." One of the results of a victory by the people in this election will certainly be the absolute and sure governmental control of transportation, and if that is found impracticable, then governmental ownership, at least of all the trunk-lines, so as to fix rates. To this end, any constitutional amendment that may be requisite will be made. Even with governmental control, a cabinet officer, "Minister of Public Works," will be created to supervise this matter, though this can be done by an act of Congress. The governmental ownership of telegraphs and telephones will require no constitutional amendment, since the electric mail is merely a betterment, the adoption of modern facilities for the post-office, and the Constitution already vests the exclusive control of the post-office in Congress. In truth, the operation of the telegraph and telephone by private corporations is illegal, being the exercise of postal functions which under the Constitution can be exercised only by the government.

There may arise other matters of urgency upon the successful issue of the present struggle in favor of the people, but the above are those constitutional guarantees which have been most in evidence in all discussions, and are those which will most logically be demanded by those intent on securing the benefits of victory. The power to make both gold and silver the money of redemption and to issue government paper which shall be a legal tender, has already been held by the Supreme Court to be in the Constitution. The struggle to make the government exercise that power will, when won, require no further constitutional guarantee. To that end it is only necessary to change the Executive. He can direct the exercise of the governmental option to pay its coin notes and bonds in silver. The further coinage of silver and the issuance of government non-interest-bearing notes to supply casual deficits instead of interest-bearing bonds, can be done by authority of a Congress in accord with him. But the struggle means more than this, and the victory of the people will be bulwarked by the exaction of the above, and possibly other, constitutional guarantees.

WALTER CLARK.

OUR NEGLECTED SHIPPING.

BY ALEX. R. SMITH, SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE ASSOCIATION.

SINCE the dawn of civilization maritime enterprise has proclaimed national vigor. History's earliest records deal with commerce and navigation. In the misty ages of Egyptian antiquity, trade and shipping created power and wealth. The Phœnicians live in history only because of their great commerce and their daring ventures afloat. Carthage was the objective of Roman prowess, because her trade, her shipping, and her riches humiliated the pride and whetted the covetousness of Roman warriors. The history of the dark ages finds its only records in the operations of Venetian commerce and the Hanseatic League. Spain's greatness departed with her shipping, and the Dutch reached the zenith of their power and wealth when their shipping was supreme. Sir Walter Raleigh said early in the seventeenth century that "whoever controls the world's shipping controls the world's commerce, and therefore the world itself." The iron hand of Cromwell outlined the course which England pursued to grasp the world's control, and the genius of Colbert could not induce the luxury-loving French to battle long with the British for the sovereignty of the seas.

The stern patriots and wise statesmen who achieved American independence and established the Republic well knew the power wielded by a great shipping, and how essential maritime independence was to national freedom and safety. With earnest purpose and almost unanimous accord the adoption of the Constitution was followed by legislative enactments protective and promotive of American shipbuilding and American shipowning. The weakness and poverty of the young nation were superseded by the power and wealth created by the policy adopted by our

forefathers, and immediately the United States took a position among the great nations of the earth. Our industries were diversified, our population was increased, our debts were paid, our commerce increased, and our shipping became enormous and famous. In the first volume of his *Twenty Years of Congress*, James G. Blaine says:

"The principle of protecting the manufactures and encouraging the navigation of America had been distinctly proclaimed in the first law of the new government, and was thus made in a suggestive and emphatic sense the very corner-stone of the republican edifice which the patriots of the Revolution were aiming to construct."

Successful afloat to a marvellous degree for more than a generation, the statesmen of the second epoch of our history failed to appreciate the causes that had made our ships the finest afloat, the envy of the world, and the successful rivals of sovereign Britain. In May, 1827, the London *Times* declared:

"The shipping interest, the cradle of our navy, is half ruined. Our commercial monopoly no longer exists; we have closed the West Indies against America from feelings of commercial rivalry. Its active seamen have already engrossed an important branch of our carrying to the East Indies. Her starred flag is now conspicuous on every sea and will soon defy our thunder."

At that time American ships had been protected in the carrying of the foreign commerce of the United States for a period of thirty-eight years. Duties on imports in foreign ships were higher than the duties on imports in American ships. During nearly the whole period the policy was in force, 90 per cent. of our commerce was carried in our ships. And yet, in the face of a success which had no parallel in history, when we possessed a shipping which had reflected honor and glory upon our flag and our seamen during the war of 1812, and which shipping was adequate for all the needs of our commerce, when our merchants were invading and occupying foreign markets, when our ships had become the standard of excellence and models for our foreign rivals, the protective legislation which had stimulated their growth and so long maintained them, was ruthlessly repealed, and free trade in the carriage of our foreign commerce inaugurated, and has lasted uninterruptedly until the present day.

When, in 1828, the discriminating duties act was abandoned, 91 per cent. of our foreign commerce was carried in American ships. At the beginning of the Civil War, thirty-three years

later, but 66 per cent. of our commerce was carried in our own ships. At the close of that war only 28 per cent. of that commerce was carried in American ships, and to-day a beggarly 11 per cent. is the sum total of American carriage.

For thirty-nine years under protection, American ships in the foreign trade steadily carried the great bulk of our foreign commerce. During sixty-eight years of free trade in the carrying of our imports and exports, the percentage carried in American ships has steadily declined. Under varying conditions, the tests of each policy have been ample and complete. The result is an emphatic vindication of protection by discriminating duties, and an equal and emphatic condemnation of free trade in the carrying of our commerce. In the October, 1894, number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, J. Henniker Heaton, an eminent member of the British Parliament, discussing "The Transatlantic Mails," took the occasion to say :

"As a consequence of refusing $5,000,000 a year in subsidies during thirty years to native shipowners, or $150,000,000, the United States had to pay in the same period no less than $3,000,000,000 for freights, while their merchant marine dwindled into insignificance."

On the same subject, in his exhaustive work *American Marine,* published in 1892, ex-U. S. Commissioner of Navigation W. W. Bates says :

"An amount of money not less than $4,500,000,000, or an average of $150,000,000 annually, for thirty years past, has been paid out to foreign ships for ocean transportation."

And, in 1890, James G. Blaine, replying to William E. Gladstone, in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, made these incisive statements :

"It will not escape Mr. Gladstone's keen observation that British interests in navigation flourish with less rivalry and have increased in greater proportion than any other of the great interests of the United Kingdom. I ask his candid admission that it is the one interest which England has protected steadily and determinedly, regardless of consistency and regardless of expense. Nor will Mr. Gladstone fail to note that navigation is the weakest of the great interests in the United States, because it is the one which the national government has constantly refused to protect."

It is frequently asserted by the free-trade press and free-trade writers of this country that the act of 1792, which prohibits American registry of foreign-built ships, is the cause of our maritime decadence. Previous to its enactment, however, and as a result of the discriminating duties act adopted three years before,

American shipping in the foreign trade had increased from 123,893 to 411,438 tons, and the proportion of our commerce carried in our ships had increased from 23 to 64 per cent. Thereafter, under the prohibitive registry act, American ships carried an average of 90 per cent. of our commerce until the discriminating duties act was repealed. Under that act, but not because of it, American shipping has reached its highest degree of prosperity and fallen to its lowest stage of impoverishment.

In the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for April, 1894, Charles H. Cramp, the Nestor of American shipbuilding, said :

"The object of the revolutionary fathers in enacting the prohibitive navigation laws of 1792 was to provide for the development and perpetuity of shipbuilding in the United States as an indispensable condition of commercial independence and an unfailing nursery of naval strength. At that time there was no need of protection to American shipbuilding in the tariff sense of the term."

In order to show the difference in the cost of building American and foreign ships, at the time the prohibitive act of 1792 was adopted, Mr. Cramp, in the same number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, quotes from the *Pennsylvania Packet*, in its issue of May 7, 1790, as follows :

"Shipbuilding is an art for which the United States are peculiarly qualified by their skill in the construction and by the materials with which the country abounds. . . .

"They build oak vessels on lower terms than the cheapest European vessels of fir, pine, and larch. The cost of a white oak ship in New England is about 24 Mexican dollars per ton fitted for sea ; a fir vessel costs in the ports of the Baltic 35 Mexican dollars per ton, though the American ship is much safer and more durable. The maximum cost of a vessel of the highest class, of American live oak and cedar, which, with salted timbers, will last 30 years without repairs, is only 36 to 38 dollars per ton in our different ports, while an oak ship, fitted in a similar manner, in the cheapest ports of England, Holland, or France, will cost 55 to 60 per ton."

It should be clear, from this, that American shipbuilding needed no protection at that time at the hands of the government. How necessary the protection of ship-*owning* was, however, is apparent in the fact that before the protective discriminating duties act was adopted but 23 per cent. of our foreign commerce was carried in our much cheaper, "safer and more durable" ships, that thereafter 90 per cent. of our commerce was carried in our ships until the protection was withdrawn, from which time our ships have constantly lost in the proportion of carriage of our foreign commerce. History thus records the fact that cheaper

ships did not enable American shipowners to compete with dearer foreign ships, without protection. How, then, now, if permitted to buy our ships at the slightly lower cost possible in foreign shipyards, would we be able to compete with our foreign rivals who enjoy the same means for purchasing the cheap ships? We would require now, as we did a hundred years ago, sufficient protection for our shipowners to enable them to pay the higher wages and provide the better food demanded by American seamen. That there is no doubt that it is more costly to run American than foreign ships there is ample free-trade authority to prove. The present Commissioner of Navigation, in his report for 1895, discussing the Postal Subsidy Act, under the terms of which four ships of the American line carry our transatlantic mails, says:

"The requirement that an increasing percentage of the crews of American transatlantic mail steamships shall be American citizens involves an annual expense for increased wages of about $60,000 a year at the present time, at the end of five years amounting annually to about $120,000, which must be paid by the contracting corporation. The officers and crews of the British mail steamers named, on the other hand, receive from the naval reserve funds about $25,000 annually."

When United States Consul at Liverpool, Capt. Charles T. Russell, an appointee of President Cleveland, made a careful investigation of the subject of the cost of running ships under the several flags. His report, made in 1887 and published in 1888, contains statistics and tables. In that report this official, who was an experienced American shipmaster, summed up his researches in part as follows:

"Reference to these tables will show that the vessels of the United States pay the highest rate of wages, besides costing more for maintenance of crews than those of any other nation. This, of course, refers to voyages commencing in the United States; but even when they commence in foreign ports, that is, ship their crews and obtain their supplies at a foreign port, they then average higher rates than vessels of other nationalities as regards cost of maintenance. . . .

"British vessels in domestic ports can procure crews for from 37 per cent. to 32 per cent. lower than those paid on American vessels, which is a serious item in the disbursement account. Then, again, the cost of maintenance on American ships is about 40 cents per day per man, against the English 29 cents, or a difference of 27 per cent. in favor of the latter. When it is considered that provisions, such as beef, pork, and flour, which are the principal articles of food consumed, can be obtained in the United States, if anything, at a lower price than in England, it seems remarkable that the crews of our vessels should cost 27 per cent. more per man for maintenance, yet such appears to be the case. . . . The wages paid on vessels belonging

to Norway and Sweden, Russia, Germany, Denmark, Austria and Spain, average about 47 to 50 per cent. lower than those of United States vessels, and the cost of maintenance about 32 per cent. less, excepting those of Germany, which cost about 10 per cent. less only."

A large number of equally competent and reliable authorities might be cited to sustain the claim that it costs more to run American than foreign ships.

No better authority on American shipping lives than United States Senator Frye, of Maine, who has been its champion in Congress for a quarter of a century. Discussing the proposition of free ships, or the repeal of the prohibitive registry act of 1792, he said in a speech delivered in New York at the Jay Centennial banquet, in December last:

"To me it is entirely clear that free ships, advocated by men of ability and intelligence, especially by our industrious and capable Commissioner of Navigation, will afford no relief. Our freight ships of like tonnage and build cost only from 10 to 15 per cent. more than England's. Extend this excess over the life of a ship say thirty years, and it is a mere bagatelle. If we should buy to-day of Great Britain a hundred new freighters at 25 per cent. less than they cost, we could not run them in the foreign trade."

In that speech, the text for which was "Our Merchant Marine," Senator Frye said that "the disease we would cure is deadly; the remedy must be drastic." He further said:

"As history has conclusively proven, discriminating duties and taxes were once a lever powerful enough to lift our marine from the depths of adversity to the heights of prosperity. Might they not again? I know there are lions in the way; thirty-five treaties to be modified or abrogated; retaliation to be confronted; but there never yet was an advancing pathway without a lion. Pluck, courage, and will generally make him a lamb."

From these statements, citations, and facts, it ought to be clear that American shipping in the foreign trade, once the pride and glory of the nation, has been sadly neglected by our lawmakers for two-thirds of a century, a circumstance as disgraceful as it is impoverishing. If anything has been conclusively proved during these sixty-eight years of free trade in the carrying of our foreign commerce, it is that free trade is the cause, and by no means the remedy, for our condition. To offer to extend the malady, by withdrawing protection from our shipbuilders—but which protection, in the absence of protection to our shipowners, we have shown to be of little value either to shipbuilders or shipowners—would only be intensifying our national losses. It is clear that we cannot run ships as cheaply as our rivals, even when we build

them cheaper. To be able to buy them as cheaply as our rivals, therefore, cannot help our disease. We must be able to run our ships, not more cheaply than foreign ships, but in spite of the cheapness of foreign ships. There is no more reason why American seamen should be degraded to the lower level of wages and of food acceptable to foreign seamen, than that our workingmen in factories should be compelled to labor for the wages paid their rivals in other countries. We protect our industries on land against the levelling of foreign competition. Shall we do less for our industries on sea? Having shown that it is essential to a re-establishment of our shipping in the foreign trade that it should be protected in operation, how can we accept the proposition to withdraw protection from our shipbuilders? The demand for ships will follow adequate protection of shipowners, and then our own shipbuilders should have the preference in furnishing the ships, by similar protection, and not by withdrawing protection just at the time protection would be helpful, both to shipowners and shipbuilders.

During the past thirty years the best means by which to restore American ships to the foreign trade has been fitfully discussed, but never settled. The Republican party favored both a bounty and a subsidy bill, the latter, providing compensation for steamships carrying the mails, being the only one adopted, but it was so emasculated as to rob it of nearly all of its intended benefits. The consequence of this has been that, during the period of five years in which it has been in operation, it has had the effect of adding but four ships to our merchant marine in the foreign trade. During the same period, a fine line of American steamships, running to Brazil, has been abandoned and the ships sold at a great loss. The bounty bill, framed upon lines similar to those of the French bounty system, passed the Republican Senate, but was defeated in the Republican House of Representatives in the Fifty-first Congress, by a close vote. Since that time a free ship bill was introduced, favorably reported by a majority of a Democratic committee, and permitted to die upon the calendar without discussion. This year Senator Elkins, of West Virginia, has introduced a bill proposing to restore the old discriminating duties policy. The Republican party in its national platform this year approved of the discriminating duties policy by adopting the following plank,

thus making protection to our shipping in the foreign trade a national issue :

"We favor restoring the early American policy of discriminating duties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine and the protection of our shipping in the foreign carrying trade, so that American ships—the product of American labor employed in American shipyards, sailing under the Stars and Stripes and manned, officered, and owned by Americans—may regain the carrying of our foreign commerce."*

Senator-elect J. B. Foraker, of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee on Platform and Resolutions at the Republican National Convention, who urged the adoption of the plank quoted, at that time said :

"We pay nearly $200,000,000 in gold annually to foreign shippers for freight transportation, every dollar of which we ought to pay at home and keep at home. This is enough of itself to cure all this money question."

The retention of two hundred millions of dollars in gold in the United States, now paid abroad to compensate foreigners for doing the carrying for us that we might far better do for ourselves, would, indeed, go a long way toward solving the money question, by diminishing the foreign demand which now bears so heavily upon us. And to spend such a sum annually among skilled American workmen would very materially aid in restoring the prosperity which we all at present so keenly feel the need of. The good to the nation, and the people, by affording employment for many thousands of men, and of largely diminishing the foreign demand for our gold, would be almost incalculable.

But if, as would appear to be the disposition of the American people, it is our intention to maintain inviolate the soil of this hemisphere against foreign seizure or occupation, it can only be done by having the means afloat with which to enforce our demands. At this time we neither have a navy sufficient to sustain us in maintaining this position, nor a merchant marine from

* Major McKinley, in his letter accepting the Republican nomination for the presidency, referring to his party' shipping plank, says:

"The declaration of the Republican platform in favor of the upbuilding of our merchant marine has my hearty approval. The policy of discriminating duties in favor of our shipping, which prevailed in the early years of our history, should be again promptly adopted by Congress and vigorously supported until our prestige and supremacy on the seas is fully attained.

"We should no longer contribute directly or indirectly to the maintenance of the colossal marine of foreign countries, but provide an efficient and complete marine of our own. Now that the American navy is assuming a position commensurate with our importance as a nation, a policy I am glad to observe the Republican platform strongly endorses, we must supplement it with a merchant marine that will give us the advantage in both our coastwise and foreign trade that we ought naturally and properly to enjoy. It should be at once a matter of public policy and national pride to repossess this immense and prosperous trade."

which to recruit our navy, either as to ships or men. No nation has ever maintained an efficient navy without, at the same time, possessing a merchant shipping adequate to its commercial needs. And a merchant shipping capable of accommodating the commerce of this nation would strengthen us where we are so fearfully weak, as well as provide a permanent and reliable reserve from which we could at any time strengthen and fortify our navy. These are possessions the value of which has been fully shown to us in the effective assistance of our ships and our seamen in the wars of 1812 and 1861. Similarly assailed now, from whence should we be able to draw the strength, the men, and the equipment needed for our defence? President Cleveland's Venezuelan message last December, and the momentous consequences which it so fearlessly invited, at least should admonish us of our one great national danger, where exists, unfortunately, our one great national weakness. Speaking of a merchant marine of our own, as long ago as 1793, Thomas Jefferson conclusively said:

"As a branch of industry it is valuable, but as a resource of defence essential."

The materials necessary for the construction of ships are to be found in vast and easily accessible quantities upon our own soil. In these possessions no nation can compare with us. Our record-breaking transatlantic liners attest the skill of our builders to construct the finest ships for commercial needs, and our warships are conceded to be the equal, class for class, of any afloat. Secretary Herbert said a little more than three years ago, while Chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, that the cost of building our war vessels had been reduced 33 per cent. in ten years, because of the rigid requirement that everything in their construction should be of American make. And more recently he has said that the present cost of building warships in the United States is about the same as the foreign cost of such constructions. With a demand for American commercial ships, sufficient for all of the commercial needs of this nation, we would undoubtedly witness a reduction in the cost of construction, and an advance in the design and finish, that would place us again ahead of other nations, and ultimately we might become not alone the builders of the ships for our own needs, but also the world's shipbuilders.

ALEX. R. SMITH.

MADAGASCAR.

BY FREDERICK TAYLOR, F. R. G. S.

MADAGASCAR, that wonderful island realm off the southeast coast of Africa, has become by the logic of recent events, as well as by intrinsic interest, an international object-lesson for the student of men and affairs. The death in exile of the late prime minister and consort to the Sovereign, Rainilairiavony, has tightened on the necks of the dominant Malagasy race, the Hovas, the yoke which the French conquerors are said to be strengthening in every direction. Nominally an independent sovereignty still, under the sway of Queen Ranavalomanjaka III., Madagascar, the greatest save New Guinea of the unexplored divisions of the world, is already a French colony.

The announcement that a marriage may be celebrated in the near future between the newly widowed but scarcely bereaved queen and some French dignitary at her capital, may be taken as evidence of Gallic diplomacy. But granting the success of the invaders in completely subjugating the Hovas of Imerina and occupying the chief Malagasy cities, Tamatave, Antananarivo, Majunga, and Diego Suarez, what is to be the future of their new colony? How is civilization to profit by this latest and greatest acquisition of France? What good will come of it to mankind at large?

My peregrinations in the interior of Madagascar and diligent personal observations of her people and their institutions do not enable me to form a flattering opinion of their future as a French colony. The notable absence of exact information about the extensive domain and wild tribes of the Malagasy was what specially attracted me to their country, of which, since Marco Polo's time, history has had little information. During my stay in the island I spared no pains to inform myself on its resources.

The French have before them the opportunity of their lives as colonizers. But what are we to expect from them in that regard, judging by their success elsewhere? If they can make nothing of the smaller islands they possess in the same waters, Nossi-Bé, Mayotte, Sainte-Marie and Réunion, what will they do with the third largest island in the world? The work of demoralization begun by the shipment of cargoes of cheap rum from Mauritius will scarcely be stayed by military and clerical despots who are now overrunning the island. There is something inconsistent in the simultaneous arrival of machine guns and Jesuits among a peaceful people who asked only to be let alone.

Let us glance at the new French dependency, its ethnological and geographical equipment and its natural possessions, which might in proper hands be made to minister to the wealth and wisdom of the world.

Southeast of and separated from Africa, of which it was probably a prehistoric part, by the Mozambique Channel, Madagascar is about one thousand miles in length, in shape an irregular oval, 350 miles in its broadest and 250 miles wide in its narrowest part. The island is almost wholly surrounded by a reef of coral, scientifically known as a fringing reef. In the primeval forest, which, in spite of the criminal waste of the natives, still covers an enormous area, there are birds, plants and animals which are not known to exist elsewhere in the world. Of the 4,100 species of indigenous plants discovered up to this time, there are, singularly enough, about 3,000, or three-fourths of the whole number, which are endemic.

The great forest which I found extending inland along the east side of the island, that is, eastward of the highest range of mountains which forms the watershed, I believe to stretch entirely around the island. It forms an unbroken belt of tropical verdure for eight hundred miles north and south along the Indian Ocean. Thus of Madagascar's 228,000 square miles, 30,000 probably remain clothed in virgin forest, and that forest teems with value to commerce.

Before Marco Polo's time all that we know of Madagascar came from Arabian sources. The Europeans who wrote of and attempted to chart this "mysterious island" after his time added nothing to our stock of information until the Portuguese discovered it in the sixteenth century. Since then the blessings and

curses of civilization have gradually been thrust on the coast dwellers. The Arabs who settled on the southeast coast, among the Antaimoro and Antanosy tribes, introduced letters among the nobility, teaching the kings and chiefs to read and write. On the northwest coast the Antalaotsi, who are not regarded as Malagasy, because their fathers were Swahili Arabs, from Africa, have a general knowledge of reading and writing. But there are no native records and the masses of the Malagasy are ignorant of the outside world. The Sakalavas, the true Malagasy of the west coast, use Arabic words denoting days of the week and the month as well as traders' words. Avoiding the large towns occupied by the Hovas, they prefer to be isolated in smaller villages. They and most of the tribes are distinctly African in type.

While there is no doubt that Madagascar derives its flora and fauna largely from Africa, preserving types now extinct elsewhere, its dominant race, the Hovas, are unquestionably of Malay origin. When this migration east from Malaysia, over the Indian Ocean, took place, we do not know. But there are distinct traces of it to-day in Cape Colony, where some of the native porters are evidently Malay.

The problem of the colonizers—they have yet to conquer the barbarous tribes who hate the Hovas almost as much as they loathe the French—is quite different to what it would be had the semi-civilized Hovas, who so readily yielded to the French, been really the governing race. I found twenty distinct tribes in existence practically independent of the Hovas, often at war with them. It will be years before they are all subdued. They all understand the general Malagasy tongue, just as many African tribes may be addressed in the Swahili dialect. It is a common medium. The Malagasy and Malay also have words and phrases in common with some of the South Sea dialects, yet the other Malagasy tribes, with scarcely an exception, have strong African characteristics relating back to the time when Madagascar was part of the mainland. The French apply the term "*Malgàche*" to them all. The natives cordially reciprocate with the epithet "rats," which is their term of utmost reproach.

When I landed at Tamatave, the chief city of Madagascar, in 1891, the French had a consular agent there and had already begun the erection of an administration building in Antananarivo, the capital, 225 miles inland. This, too, although formal

possession of the capital was not taken by the French troops until 1895, and in spite of the fact that at the present writing Queen Ranavalomanjaka III. is still nominally the sovereign. Indeed, the recent interruption of diplomatic relations between Washington and Antananarivo was due to a polite doubt as to the present status of the agents accredited from the United States to the Hova Court. How soon the French will abolish the latter may depend largely on the personality of the French consort to be, who will have to be endowed with much shrewdness and great resolution to be the equal of her aged but able first husband and prime minister, Rainilairiavony. The native newspapers had already in 1891 taken the alarm and were appealing to English influence and to Hova pride to avert the impending invasion. The British—who were represented by traders in Tamatave, and by most of the agents through whom the Hovas from their inland province of Imerina communicated with the outer world, as well as by the Protestant missionaries—might even then have got the upper hand had their government for reasons of its own not abandoned Madagascar to the French Republic. The pioneer missionaries, who had been stationed among many tribes for more than thirty years, were mostly English, and their maps and pamphlets furnished practically the only genuine information then to be had about the interior. But the French were entrenched close by in Mauritius, at Réunion, where they have a large military station, and in the other smaller island colonies I have mentioned. Their invasion and the seizure of Antananarivo have passed into history.

From the actual enemy opposed to them the invaders had no great glory to gain. There was no man to meet them face to face. The chief of the Hovas, who were the chief of the Malagasy, was the aged Rainilairiavony, the prime minister, who has just paid with his life the penalty of his senile indifference to French intrigue. His wife, Queen Ranavalomanjaka III., who had ascended the throne of the Hovas in July, 1883, was then just thirty years old, a slender, brown, good-looking woman of pure Hova stock. She reigned nominally in undisputed sway, her minister consort being thirty-four years her senior, cruel, crafty, patient, and once powerful, a brown Machiavelli, ruling with a rod of iron.

In Tamatave, the port of the east side, the French hold the

key to the island. The town, of about 4,000 inhabitants, is built of wooden houses along one narrow main street and a number of still narrower by-lanes, all covered with thick sand, difficult to walk over. It lies along a low, flat promontory jutting out into the Indian Ocean, with a grassy and often swampy plain in its rear. Eight or ten miles in the interior, ranges of well-wooded hills begin, rising in height as one penetrates back from the coast, and forming a magnificent series of natural terraces separated in some instances by dangerous swamps. It was through that succession of hill and swamp that the French had to march about two hundred and twenty-five miles inland to Antananarivo, with its hundred thousand inhabitants, by far the largest city of the island. Indeed, there are no other cities save Majunga, on the northwest coast, of several thousand inhabitants, and Diego Suarez, the very valuable port on the northern extremity of the island, unless there be buried cities in the morasses of the interior, of which I saw no signs, however, in many patient journeys.

The harbor of Diego Suarez is the finest on the Indian Ocean. It is entered by a cramped narrow channel, but soon widens out, three or four semi-circular bays opening into it. It is, as the French will find when they make it a naval station, a difficult port, however, for sailing vessels. Once inside its hospitable arms there's no telling when they will get out, as there are no tugs, and the wind is rarely favorable for their exit. When I visited this port there were two sailing ships at anchor in the harbor that had been forty-two days trying to get away.

Climate and topography will, of course, enter largely as factors into the problem of the pacification and development of Madagascar by the French. The chances are also that they have already offended the superstitions of the native tribes in many ways, and that the question whether he is a Protestant according to British teaching or a Roman Catholic under the new Jesuit régime will not be considered as dispassionately by a black man, wont to worship the soul of his grandfather in the bizarre body of a lemur, as it would be if he had not grown sullen through years of slavery and starvation.

It is here that the French must meet their chief difficulty. The barbarous natives of Madagascar have not only lived for a generation under a reign of terror fostered by the despotic chiefs of the half-civilized Hovas ; they have been actually on the verge

of starvation for years. Misrule and misery have been their portion in the midst of one of earth's fairest possessions and owing to conditious difficult to be understood by an outsider. What else could be expected from the most cruel slavery and the most degraded superstitions co-ordinating in a social life without comfort and without hope?

The chief characteristic of the Madagascan landscape seemed to me to be an alternation of mountain and swamp, jungle and cataract. In 225 miles I crossed 362 waterways. The highest range, the Ankaratra Mountains, in the province of Imerina, reach the height of 9,000 feet above sea level.

The temperature varies considerably, the northwest part of the island being the hottest. The temperature of the elevated interior is not many degrees higher than that of London. Malarial fever exists to some extent throughout the island, but is worse on the East coast. Hundreds of Frenchmen died of it; indeed in the swamps of the interior it becomes almost pernicious, and is a factor to be considered seriously by the colonizing power. For some days after I left Tamatave my journey lay along the coast, and made me a witness, against my will, to some of the horrors of "war" between a civilized power and savage tribes. Here and there on the beach, sometimes far inland, I saw torpedoes which had been fired at Malagasy villages, or, perhaps, in pure wantonness by French naval vessels. The innocent natives, ignorant even that hostilities were in progress, had taken, and were taking up these great unexploded cartridges with glee, as playthings. A half dozen Malagasy would lay two torpedoes side by side in the sand, set their rice pot in the hollow between them, and then kindle a fire around it. The slaughter which would ensue must have been entirely beyond the proper scope of the plans of the French War Office.

No stranger can be long in discovering that there are no horses, no mules, no draft animals except oxen, and no roads in Madagascar. In the heart of the forests which have not yet been overtaken by decay the scenery is wonderfully beautiful; there are no dangerous animals except the crocodiles, with which the island's myriad watercourses abound.

The eastern half of the island consists almost entirely of crystalline rocks, chiefly gneiss, and the western half of a sedimentary formation.

The conditions favor the existence not only of extensive deposits of alluvial gold in the valleys, but also true leads in the mountains. I found nuggets of free gold in several placer beds and recognized quartz lodes in the hills. Before I left the island concessions for gold mining had been granted by the Hova government to Europeans. A mere scratching of the surface had revealed the yellow metal in sufficient quantities to excite Christian greed, and late news by cable about the possibilities of Madagascar's becoming the world's next great gold-field confirm the conclusions I arrived at. The gold found in Madagascar varies in color and is excellent in quality. The Hova government required a royalty of 55 per cent. of the gross output of a mine under the old régime of Rainilairiavony. The conditions, now, under French influences, and at least to French *concessionaires,* will undoubtedly be so modified as to stimulate the indulgence of its gold fever by the civilized world.

Whereupon the interesting question arises: Can France hold Madagascar if it becomes the world's next gold-field? Will not Anglo-Saxon enterprise, whether it be British or American, inflamed by the lust for the yellow metal, which Briton and American alike develop to such a rabid degree on occasion, find a way to seize on the land in which the gold is found? The two nations, one in so many racial characteristics, own Australia, South Africa, and California. The next century may see changes in both British Guiana and Madagascar.

The east coast of Madagascar is covered with large quantities of pumice stone, with many bivalves attached. No diamonds or other precious stones have yet been found, so far as I can learn, and no coal, although attempts have lately been made to form companies for the development of supposed coal-fields in Madagascar. My investigations led me to the belief that there is no coal in the island—geologically, another evidence of its great antiquity.

Tribal institutions prevailed among the other natives before the French invasion, and indeed, still prevail, in spite of the French residencies; the Hovas have had their own dynasty for many generations, and their palace, at Antananarivo, is a handsome and conspicuous edifice.

The claims of Antananarivo to be the capital of Madagascar are not of very ancient date. For a long time it has been the

chief town of Imerina, the home of the Hova tribe, but was not the original capital of even that province. Arabohimanga, a town located on a well-wooded hill ten or twelve miles north of Antananarivo, had that honor, and it is customary for the sovereign to pay a visit to the place once a year, just about the Fandroana festival time. It has only been within the last sixty or seventy years that the government of Madagascar has become so consolidated as to give any one tribe supreme power. The name of the capital is derived from two common words, *tanana*, a town, and *arivo*, a thousand, and its most probable meaning is the Town of a Thousand. It is built on the ridge and down the sides of a hill, nearly two miles in length, and from some directions may be seen fully twenty-eight miles away. It is, of course, the seat of the French protectorate.

The English officers are said to have made soldiers out of the fellaheen. The character of the native Egyptians must have been as difficult to mould as that of the Malagasy. What can the French make out of the Hovas? Or the warlike Sihanakas, their hereditary foes? Or the Betsimisarakas? Or the Tanhosy? Or the fierce Sakalavas?

There are two native institutions which stand in the way of any advancement. They are *fanompoana* and slavery.

Fanompoana, briefly described, is a feudal service, which obliges the male population, *nolens volens*, to perform military and civic duties without payment of any kind from the government. Judges, for instance, and peasants, serve side by side in the army, or in some other way, without any remuneration whatever. This institution naturally fosters all kinds of corruption, bribery, and deceit, and is utterly antagonistic to all enterprise, as well as unfavorable to inventive genius. The influence of the French will eventually supersede the *fanompoana*. Domestic slavery, although unattended with much cruelty, is of course vitally detrimental to progress. From these two evils others are inseparable. The gross superstitions and the low estimate of the value of human life prevailing among many of the tribes are directly traceable to the influence of servitude.

The slave population in Madagascar is divided into three classes. The Zara-Hova, the Andevo and the Mozambiques. The Zara are of the same stock as the Hovas themselves from the central provinces, their ancestors having become slaves either

from being sold for debt, or as a punishment for certain crimes. The second, the Andevo or slaves proper, are descendants of those captured in the numerous wars carried on by the Hovas under Radama I. and Ranavalona I. Then come the Mozambiques or African slaves who were brought into the country by the Arabs very many years ago, and who have now been set free.

No respectable Malagasy would carry with him any small article. It must be taken by a slave, boy or girl, who follows. If two slaves, who are brothers, are going on a journey, the burden must be carried by the younger one if he is strong enough.

Space forbids further mention of the natural treasures of Madagascar, in which the whole world cannot fail to feel an interest. I have alluded to the fascinating fact that the flora and fauna are largely different from those of the rest of the world. I may say that from a commercial point of view the great Madagascar forest furnishes in abundance hard-wood trees like mahogany, satin wood, teak, ebony, and a great variety of beautifully veined woods for building purposes and cabinet work, parqueterie flooring and architectural uses.

Magnetic iron ore abounds and is smelted by the natives and hammered into spades, spear heads, knives, and hatchets. Tin has not been discovered in Madagascar, but lead is found and the Hovas make bullets of it. Copper is found in quantities, and will prove of great value to the new owners of the island. While the native jewellers make rings and chains of the placer gold, and of English sovereigns melted down, all their silver jewellery is made from the French five-franc piece, which suggests the singular lack of any other currency in all Madagascar. Indeed, except in Diego Suarez and Tamatave, the only money in circulation is the segments of the five-franc piece cut by hammer and chisel into various sizes and weighed out, when used as money, in the small scales which every person of any consequence is supposed to carry with him.

The task of evolving from the chaotic conditions here outlined, a great and prosperous country, such as the twentieth century has a right to expect in a land so richly endowed as Madagascar, is one that France is now called upon to perform under the eyes of the civilized world.

FREDERICK TAYLOR.

WHY AMERICAN INDUSTRY LANGUISHES.

BY THE HON. HILARY A. HERBERT, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

NO FIGURES are required to prove that the people of the United States are not to-day in a prosperous condition. General depression began early in the winter of 1892–3, and in the summer of 1893 developed into a disastrous panic. The ensuing Congress, after a long and acrimonious discussion, repealed the Sherman law, which had provided for the monthly purchase of 54,000,000 ounces of silver. Throughout this discussion the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver had contended that "hard times" were the outcome of a scarcity of money and that free silver was the only remedy. The friends of "sound money" argued that the continued purchase of silver bullion and the issuance of treasury-notes based upon this bullion had begotten a want of confidence in our currency system and that this was the cause of business depression. Without stopping here to inquire which, if either, had the right of the question, the fact cannot be denied that the repeal of the Sherman law was followed by a temporary revival of business and a smart increase of prices; which, however, did not cause the leading advocates of free silver to cease their demands.

In the meantime, the Wilson revenue law had been passed, containing provision for an income tax. When the question was brought before it, the Supreme Court declared this tax unconstitutional. This decision created widespread discontent, and added much strength to the Populist party, which for years had been advocating not only an income tax but also various plans for the increase of our currency, and among them the free and unlimited coinage of silver. The Wilson law would have brought in sufficient revenue if the provision for an income tax had been able to stand before the bar of the Supreme Court. As it was, there was

a deficiency of revenue, and then the Republican party aligned itself in a vigorous assault on the Wilson law, declaring with loud emphasis that trade had been destroyed because some of the burdens it had previously carried had been lifted from it. All the woes of the country, it was said, came from the passage of that act.

From some cause or other it resulted that, in the fall and winter of 1895–96, the tide of returning confidence was checked, and gold again began to be exported in large quantities. Whether this was the outcome of the joint assaults made upon the executive department of the government by the advocates of free silver in and out of the Populist party on the one hand, and by the Republican party on the other, it is bootless now to inquire ; but it soon came about that it was necessary to sell bonds for gold with which to maintain the credit of the country. No other means has ever been pointed out by which the Administration could have maintained each dollar issued by the government at par with every other dollar as required by law. The Congress had rejected every plan submitted to it by the Secretary of the Treasury, and would provide no scheme of its own. The sale of bonds, which was twice repeated, necessarily increased the debt, and this added fuel to the flames of discontent. Out of this discontent came the Chicago platform and the Chicago nominations. The candidate for the Presidency, standing upon that platform, is acceptable to the Populist party, and so Populists and Democrats combined are waging a great campaign based upon the allegation that the hard times in the United States are directly traceable to the want of a law for the unlimited coinage of silver.

It is sometimes but not always possible to satisfactorily assign causes for monetary crises. The panic of 1837, for example, was undoubtedly caused by over-speculation and over-issues of bank notes, cheap money. The panic of 1857, though not so severe or so lasting, it has always been difficult to account for. What caused and what is prolonging the effects of the panic of 1893 is a question which is now the subject of debate throughout the United States, and there is no doubt but that the masses of the people are anxiously seeking to find out the truth of this matter.

The adherents of Mr. Bryan, in support of their claim that the so-called "crime of 1873" is responsible for present conditions, are contending that free silver countries are all prospering,

and Mexico especially they point to as proving the truth of the assertion. That the industries of Mexico are improving, that her exports and imports are increasing, may be admitted and readily accounted for. Under President Diaz she has enjoyed internal peace, entire freedom from any serious or damaging attempts at domestic revolution, for a period now extending through some sixteen years or more, which is absolutely unprecedented in her history since 1820. This would be sufficient to account for quite as much progress as she is making, without taking into consideration her railroad system, which has now been completed and which is aiding in her development. But notwithstanding all favoring circumstances, economic conditions in Mexico, although she occupies vast areas of undeveloped territory, are far below those existing in the western part of the old world, and the miserable stipends being paid to Mexican laborers are very much lower than the wages now received by European workmen, while the Mexican gets only about one-fourth as much as the American. If those who are comparing progress in Mexico with the want of progress in our country should care to extend the range of their observations, they might safely assert that there is now no country in the civilized world, natural advantages considered, that is so unprosperous as the United States, no matter what their tariff systems or their money systems may be.

The writer left America on the 12th of August, deeply impressed with the distressful conditions prevailing at home. He landed in England on the 19th, and was at once struck with the fact that he was in a prosperous country. Everywhere smoke was going up from factory chimneys, everywhere people were at work, and nowhere, in any newspaper, did he see any complaint of hard times. Reports of the earnings of English railways for the past half-year were just being published. Summarizing the net revenues of the twelve principal companies, it appeared that these showed an aggregate increase, as compared with the corresponding period of last year, of $5,600,000, or nine per cent. The London *Times* said, in discussing the question, that "this permitted the boards of all the companies to declare most satisfactory dividends." It goes without saying that "satisfactory dividends" by its chief railways clearly indicate the general prosperity of a country. An intelligent Ameri-

can, who is superintendent of the largest coke works in the United States, when the writer called his attention to these dividends, not only agreed to the above conclusion, but added that he had recently been through the iron and coke regions in England and Germany, and found all their industries prospering ; all seemed to have orders ahead, and in Germany there were, as a rule, advance orders for twelve months to come. He added that the iron industries of France were also prospering, and that is found to be true. In Paris it is agreed on all sides that France is rapidly emerging from the depression that has recently affected to a greater or less extent all great industrial nations. Statistics as to exports and imports for the past eight months were recently published. As compared with the corresponding period of last year, the exports of raw materials for manufactories have fallen off 33,372,000 francs. This year the French workmen want these materials at home. Not only so, but they need and have imported during these eight months 114,433,000 francs more of such material than they consumed during the same months of last year. This means that there is and is to be plenty of labor for the French working man. This is further indicated by the fact that the exports of manufactured goods show an increase up to August 31, of 41,413,000 francs. Why should not workmen in the United States share this reviving prosperity with the laborers of England, France, and Germany ? Opportunities in our own country are certainly greater than in Europe.

If we consult our own memories, and especially if we examine the statistics of exports and imports, we find that the period of depression now so much discussed commenced in the United States in the winter of 1892-3, and that also, much about the same time, signs of business distress, not, however, so aggravated, began to be observable in the other principal countries of the world. It is argued now that all this depression was caused by the demonetization of silver, although that demonetization, in so far as it existed, took place twenty years before the period of depression set in. In view of all that occurred during that twenty years, nothing would seem to be more illogical. That widespread depression did exist, and that it still exists with us in an aggravated form cannot be disputed ; but it is equally indisputable that the decade from 1881 to 1890, in-

clusive, was a period of almost unprecedented prosperity for all great industrial peoples, with one exception, and that exception was France. The exports and imports of France fell off 55 millions of dollars in 1883, 193 millions in 1884, and 121 millions in 1885. When it is remembered that France has more money per capita than any other nation, it may be well to point out these facts to illustrate that prosperity does not depend upon the amount of money in circulation. A fair amount of money is necessary, but other circumstances must always be considered; and it is only fair to say that but for the ravages of the phylloxera, which largely destroyed its vines, and for other crop disasters, industrious France would during this period have prospered as much, perhaps, as the Germans and others who had far less money per capita. The period from, say 1875 to 1891, inclusive, may, therefore, be pointed to as an era during which America and all Europe prospered, save only where local causes interfered. Now, this prosperous period began just after the silver dollar had been dropped from the coinage laws of the United States by what is called the "crime of 1873," and just after silver had ceased to be coined in France, Germany, and other European countries. Was the general stoppage of the coinage of silver which took place in America, and in most of the countries of Europe, prior to the end of the year 1874, the cause of the prosperity which followed? It would be far more reasonable to say that it was than it now is to attribute to this same cause the business depression of to-day in America. Effect usually follows cause promptly unless there be something to prevent. If we would find the effects of this act of 1873, let us go nearer than 1893.

Speaking from memory, Germany and France had both entirely stopped the coinage of legal-tender silver by the end of 1874.

The following table, from a volume of *Commercial Relations of the United States*, contains instructive figures. The table is copied in full from the beginning down to and including the year 1891. A rest is made at the end of 1874 to get the averages of imports and exports as far back as the table gives them in each case. Thenceforward the average is taken for each six years. Allowing for natural variations in particular years, the progress of the three countries was steady from the date when they had severally ceased to coin silver. The United States made

the most rapid strides, increasing her business from 1,046 to 1,548 millions at the last average taken. Our most notable advance was in the year 1880, the year after we had reached a specie basis.

GENERAL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS COMBINED IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS—SPECIE VALUES.

Year.	Germany.	France.	United States.
1870	....	1,354	864
1871	....	1,408	1,033
1872	1,853	1,802	1,124
1873	2,024	1,829	1,163
Average	1,988	1,598	1,046
1874	1,958	1,776	1,131
1875	2,011	1,804	1,014
1876	2,055	1,840	1,018
1877	2,055	1,740	1,100
1878	1,999	1,791	1,168
1879	2,054	1,917	1,278
Average	2,022	1,811	1,118
1880	2,076	2,069	1 586
1881	2,165	2,086	1,503
1882	2,319	2,088	1,520
1883	2,395	2,033	1,482
1884	2,293	1,840	1,378
1885	2,041	1,729	1,276
Average	2,215	1,974	1,458
1886	2,066	1,822	1,376
1887	2,191	1,772	1,424
1888	2,264	1,830	1,416
1889	2,433	1,953	1,597
1890	1,996	1,986	1,680
1891	2,032	2,059	1,798
Average	2,164	1,904	1,548

These tables certainly show that, with the exception of France during certain disastrous crop years, all these four countries were prospering until about the years 1892–3. Does all this long period of prosperity following immediately after the cessation of silver coinage show that such cessation was wise? Not necessarily, but these facts do show the wisdom of having a stable money system that gives encouragement to labor and employment to capital. It was the stability of the money systems of Europe and America that gave to the world its most prosperous period. During this period the South was running up its cotton crop to nearly ten millions of bales; a single State, Alabama, had come to produce more iron than all of the United States did in 1860;

railroads had opened up vast wheat fields in the far Northwest. Also in India, in Russia, and the Argentine Republic inventors had been busy and manufacturers were producing double, and sometimes were quadrupling their products of thirty years before. Markets thus became glutted, and the natural result was that industries were obliged, some of them, to rest, until consumption should create new demand. New demand has sprung up, prosperity is returning, the working men of England, of Germany, and of France are sharing in it. Why should our laborers, so many of them, remain idle? It is not either in Europe or America a question of tariff. England has and has had free trade. France has had and is having protection, and so of Germany. The United States has fewer burdens than any of them and more resources than all of them combined. There is something in America more destructive than the *phylloxera* was at one time in France, or than the cotton worm ever was in the Southern States. It is the agitation of the silver question, which has destroyed confidence in the future, frightened capital, crippled industries, and thrown labor out of employment. The Chicago platform favors the remonetization of silver at 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid of any other nation. When our first coinage law was passed in 1792, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson agreed that the ratio of 15½ to 1 was the proper ratio, because they reckoned that to be the world's market ratio as affected by the coinage laws of other nations. When, in 1802, Jefferson as President stopped the coinage of the silver dollars, he did so because he saw that the silver dollar was being exported to satisfy the demands for silver as created by the markets and coinage laws of other nations. It was about three or four per cent. difference that caused the exportation. When, in 1834, Thomas H. Benton succeeded in passing through Congress, and Jackson approved, a law changing the ratio from 15½ to 16 for 1, it was done because Benton and Jackson and a majority of Congress saw that a difference of from three to five per cent. as made by the markets and coinage laws of the world was actually driving gold out of the United States. Jefferson and Benton and Jackson knew what they were doing, for they had the facts before their eyes. A large majority of the business men of our country, arguing upon the lessons upon which Jefferson and Jackson acted, believe that if the United States should

by themselves undertake the unlimited coinage of silver, the existing difference of 45 cents between the bullion values of gold and silver dollars would drive out the dearer metal, gold, and leave us on silver alone; that we should have only one metal in circulation, instead of two, as now. This they believe would be bad for the farmer, bad for the working man, and bad for all the business interests of the country. This fear of the future and this agitation for free silver tell us why so much labor is to-day unemployed, and why England, France, and Germany are going ahead of us.

HILARY A. HERBERT.

THE SHIP OF STATE ADRIFT.—II.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

THE Ship of State, drifting in May last heedless of impending danger, found the tempest upon her in June. Rising waves soon revealed the hitherto sunken rocks and the breakers ahead, upon which many a noble ship has gone to pieces. "Revolt against Supreme Court," "Toleration of Riot," "Abolition of Right of Contract," "Debased Money," with all their ragged and dangerous peaks, were now for the first time clearly seen. Fortunate, indeed, that the revolutionary forces congregated at Chicago dashed themselves with such violence against the sunken rocks as to reveal their presence, and thus warn the Ship of State while there was yet time to change its course.

The nation for a moment is stunned by the Chicago platform and nominees, paralysis strikes the business world, mines close, factories shut down, millions of spindles stop, railroads retrench, wages fall, labor is dismissed, confusion reigns in finance and commerce, failures increase and confidence is gone. For a time, short, though apparently long, no voice was heard strong enough to rally the conservative forces of the country in defence of law, order, and honesty. To the leader of the Republican party the now thoroughly alarmed nation naturally turned. The man who volunteered and risked his life in defence of his country when yet in his teens, was not likely to prove a laggard in his prime, when the foundations were attacked upon which the government of his country rests. He met the issue squarely, each successive declaration being more and more emphatic. His last words

NOTE.—At the request of Mr. Carnegie, the editor waives, in the case of this article, the restrictions that he is usually obliged to impose as to the length of excerpts taken from contributions to THE REVIEW. Newspapers and periodicals are therefore requested to copy as freely as they choose from Mr. Carnegie's contribution to the present number.—EDITOR NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

show that he sinks the partisan in the patriot: "Government by law must be first assured; everything else can wait." He has risen to the height of the great argument. Not the first of our public men to realize the true nature of the assault upon civilized society, or the disastrous results certain to flow from poisoning the money of his country with depreciated silver, and hence not the first to draw the sword; but he may be trusted to stand among the last who sheathe it, for he comes not of a race that falters when once aroused. The Covenanter's strain derived from a strong mother is in his blood, and bound to tell in the stormy days which may confront him. There is much of Lincoln's sweet temper in Major McKinley; there will also be found much of Lincoln's steadfastness to principle. The challenge thrown down by the reckless assembly at Chicago is accepted, and as the war for the Union was fought through to the end, so this war must be. The strife is mortal; one or the other must perish, for law and license cannot co-exist.

The great party which sprang to the defence of the Union is again in line of battle, ready to fight for the preservation of all that makes that Union worth fighting for—the reign of law, order, honesty; and, as in the war for the Union, so in this war for the rights, liberties, and safeguards of the Constitution, under the Union, and for honest money, that party finds at its side, fully abreast and equally loyal, the mass of sterling men of the Democratic party who hold party subordinate to country. That these united forces are to succeed against all who may oppose is not to be doubted; for government of the people, for the people, and by the people, under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, is not to perish from the face of the earth.

The United States stands to-day once more before the world seen and known of all men as a nation which depends not upon any one party to maintain unimpaired its conservative Constitution, which establishes law, holds contracts inviolable, and ensures the reign of peaceful government.

The official leaders, as well as the foremost men of both parties, although differing in non-essentials, stand shoulder to shoulder equally staunch in defence of the only vital questions now before the people.

Such a spectacle has not been witnessed since the shot fired at Fort Sumter once before fused the best men of these same par-

ties into one loyal mass. Sad day were it for our country if the precious fruits of the centuries became the sacred charge of any one party, and ceased to be the first care of the loyal men of both!

This union means that the Republic is true to itself, and vindicates democracy, and is the answer to all doubts and sneers as to the capacity of the people for self-government regulated by law. Let doubters behold it and learn that partisanship is only upon the surface, and that patriotism lies deep below in both parties in the land of triumphant democracy.

As a private in the ranks of the Republican party, the admiration and gratitude of the writer go forth not chiefly to his own leaders, but equally to those of the National Democratic party. Ours have had to make no draft upon their courage, or to sacrifice anything—to wrench no ties, nor to stand up against the majority of their own household in defence of their convictions. When the struggle is over and the guarantees of the Constitution stand vindicated and unshaken, the present gold standard is safe, and the government relieved from banking, as this purified party so wisely demands, the profound thanks of the American people will be due for service done the state to the leaders of the National Democratic party, for these have greatly dared.

There was difference of opinion as to the advisability of these men organizing as a party and nominating candidates; but this has been most successfully done, and is, in the writer's view, one of the most cheering features of the situation, because it ensures the continuance of one of the two great historic parties as a loyal party, subordinate, as all parties should ever be, to the claims of the country as a whole, in emergencies which threaten the existence of its fundamental principles. The platform opens with a splendid preamble:

> "This convention has assembled to uphold the principles on which depend the honor and welfare of the American people, in order that Democrats throughout the Union may unite their patriotic efforts to avert disaster from their country and ruin from their party."

We venture to call the attention of thoughtful men of both parties to the fact that the platform ignores the international bimetallic delusion, advocacy of which by the few who should have known better has deluded the people into the belief that there is something imperfect in the gold standard, when there is not;

and further, that the platform demands the release of the government from banking. In these respects the loyal Democracy point out the only true solution of the financial problem.

The old historic Democratic party is an invaluable possession to the nation, when in the day of trouble it thus dedicates itself anew, to uphold not party shibboleths but those principles upon which rest the welfare and honor of our common country; for next in value to a body of able leaders in power follows that of an able body of leaders in opposition, each having the confidence of the masses of intelligent voters comprising the party it represents. It is essential for our system of party government that the contending hosts should be disciplined, not guerilla, forces —and led by able men of character, education, and experience in public affairs.

The country was fortunate in this respect until the Civil War, which destroyed the power of the hitherto trusted leaders of the Democratic party, especially of the South, and left that party no longer rich as it had been in leaders of national reputation based upon eminent public service. The crisis which has just arisen in its history may be trusted to replace these, for its future leaders are sure to be developed by the upheaval which has occurred, and must be found among the prominent men of to-day who have remained true to the traditions of the party and resisted the attempt to sink Democracy into Populism. Under the play of party government it is certain that the opposition party is to obtain power at intervals, and the country is to be congratulated already upon the assurance which the Indianapolis Convention gives, in the character and action of its members, that the government can safely be trusted to their hands when the people demand a change.

It will, we think, be felt that, since the co-operation of many of the members of the National Democratic party is essential for the speedy and final vindication of constitutional safeguards, and the maintenance of the national honor in finance, Republicans should labor to remove, to the greatest extent possible, everything of a nature calculated to offend the susceptibilities of their allies. The question which causes the most friction between the two loyal organizations, and which may deter many from voting for McKinley, is that of protection. The writer submits that it is unnecessary to raise this question under

present conditions. The government's revenues are insufficient under existing laws. Both parties agree that these should promptly be made amply sufficient by additional taxation. The question should be treated therefore solely as one of revenue.

A committee composed of the leaders of both parties would agree, we believe, that imports should contribute a proportion of the increased revenue required, especially since it will be found by the testimony of Democratic as of Republican Collectors, Revenue Inspectors, and Custom House officials, that the amount of revenue levied by the present Wilson-Gorman tariff is not received. The change from the specific to the *ad valorem* system results in the government losing a percentage of from 25 to 30 per cent. of the duties due under the law through undervaluations, which are driving honest importers out of the business. A proposition to make good this loss through a specific duty added to present duties should obtain the support of National Democrats as a matter of revenue; and the additional percentage necessary for this should be satisfactory to reasonable Republicans.

The difference which keeps the two wings of the loyal host apart is, under present conditions, more a word than a thing. "Taxes upon imports levied for revenue," and "taxes upon imports levied for protection," produce the same result, and both must involve incidental protection, which one party may think needed and the other not needed. But upon this point they may safely be left to agree to differ, resolving to settle it when the question of high or low tariff becomes a question of policy, apart from one of pressing necessity to provide revenues sufficient to meet the expenditures of the government.

Our Republican brethren might consider why they should care to have an advance upon duties upon imports charged to protection when these can be obtained through the needs of revenue. To demand protection, offends true and loyal allies; to base increased duties upon revenue needs, is not only admissible at present, but proper, under the strictest traditions of the National Democratic party, which has declared for a revenue tariff. It would seem politic for leaders of the Republican party to confer, and remove, if possible, this chief impediment to many Democrats voting for McKinley.

The writer feels as if an apology were due for introducing the subject of protection at all; for compared with the vital issues of

the contest now upon us, it is trifling in the extreme, a mere question of policy involving no principle when viewed from the revenue standpoint, as it should be. No matter how treated it cannot endanger the nation, or the existence of liberty regulated by law, or of sound finance, and, therefore, should not keep loyal men apart. The subject is mentioned only in the hope that now, since the continuity of their pure Democratic party is assured, reflection will bring some, at least, of the loyal Democrats in doubtful States to realize the grave responsibility which rests upon them to vote direct for McKinley, to the end that the victory over the forces which menace what is precious in the Republic may be overwhelmingly decisive and enable the forces of law, order, and sound finance speedily to free the country from all cause of anxiety, and allow it to return once more to the paths of development and peaceful prosperity. When that is done, the country may dispute to its heart's content upon the details of bills for levying duties upon imports and similar subjects; the importance then attached to such questions being cheering proof that the country has solved those deeper problems which touch the national life.

The staunchest Democrat cannot feel that he has wandered far from the path of genuine Democratic traditions if he follows where Hewitt and Phelps and other trusted leaders lead.

For years it has seemed that our rock ahead was the silver question, which is, no doubt, chargeable with the business depression which has reigned, and which to-day makes such a contrast between Great Britain and the United States. Britain has upheld the gold standard and swept the advocates of international bimetallism out of court, and has consequently attracted the capital of the world, including 250 millions of dollars of United States gold within the past few years. Her records show gains over preceding years in almost every department of business; advances of wages are granted in almost every case when demanded; money is superabundant and freely lent at 1½ per cent. per annum; the government's revenues were never so high. This contrast comes solely from one cause: threats of changing the standard of value in the United States have alarmed capital and driven it from us.

This material reverse seemed our most important question when the first article on "The Ship of State" was written for

this REVIEW in May last. To-day it occupies not even the second, but has fallen to the third, place. The material prosperity of the nation is one thing, the preservation of the constitutional provisions which insure the reign of law and order, and the right of contract, quite another. The rocks ahead with which the citizen has now to concern himself are the assault upon the Supreme Court. The great arbiter, whose decisions must be accepted by all, if there is to be peace, is not only assailed, but its independence, upon which just decisions depend, is to be swept away; its members are to be subjected to popular election, and dependent upon the number of votes for their places from time to time. This is a question compared with which even the standard of value cannot be classed.

The power of the Executive to use the armed forces of the Republic to quell disorder, wherever it rears its monstrous head, is to be abolished, and the mails and inter-State commerce of the United States are to be subject to the fury of any local mob, should the Governor of a State fail to do his sworn duty. This is the second vital question before us, and only third in rank and importance, vital as it is for our material prosperity, comes the maintenance of the standard of value—gold—which only follows these at a great distance; for what would it profit a nation to have material prosperity if law and order were not maintained, and the rights of citizens determined by a final court of appeal free from dependence upon popular caprice? The question is an impossible one, since material prosperity has never existed, and never can exist, except upon the secure foundations of law and order, the righteous judicial judgment of disputes between men, and adherence to the established standard of value.

The State may be great and its people may be happy without overflowing material prosperity: human life in Switzerland and in Scotland is desirable and happy without the abundance of material things with which our country is blessed. But the roots of civilization never yet found sustenance until they drew upon law and order.

Fortunately, the National Democratic and the Republican parties are at one in defence of the only three vital principles at issue in this portentous contest—the maintenance, in all their rights and powers, of the Supreme Court, the National Executive, the Gold Standard.

For several years the Ship of State has drifted; she drifts no longer. The danger ahead is seen; all hands are aroused; new men are about to take command; a change of course has been decided upon. Among the breakers she still struggles, but she has been among breakers before; there was no thought of giving up the ship then; there is none now. At midnight, November 3d, there shall be heard ringing out upon the darkness the sweetest words that can come to the tempest-tossed—"All's well!" Not one who has cast his vote for law, order, and honesty will consider whether he be Republican or Democrat; but every one will feel he is an American, with this prayer deep in his heart:

"Sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee!"

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

PURPOSE IN ART.

MR. GRANT ALLEN has heard so many voices attacking "the novel with a purpose," and, in particular, his own last novel as a violent outbreak of an irrepressible purpose, that it is no wonder a gentleman of argumentative and scientific temperament should be moved to retort upon his critics. "The novel without a purpose" is, on the contrary, according to him, the crime against art, and he proves it by many doughty instances, from Homer to Sarah Grand, each one warranted to knock down at a single blow.

But is it not all a war of words, which must settle the question between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum at the cost of many raw throats and deafened ears? And when it is all over, the world will shake its wise old head and wonder what it was all about. Unquestionably all art has a purpose, which may be broadly defined as the presentation of truth in the form of beauty. Art is great and enduring in direct proportion to the universality of the truth it expresses and the grace of the form it chooses. If the truth transcends time, and the form follows deep immutable instincts of harmony, the art will endure through all changes of custom and accidents of opinion; we shall have Homer forever singing the beauty of the physical life, the Gothic cathedrals forever praying upward, Dante forever disclosing the pilgrimage of the soul, Shakespeare forever revealing the relations and contrasts of character and circumstance.

But it is only at rare intervals that a master appears in whom the half-formed thought, the vague desire of an epoch, becomes symmetrical and harmonious—a prophet who musically utters the hope of the world. In him the purpose, if one may call it so, is so vast that one cannot trace it; like the creative energy in nature, it proves itself only by light and love. In proportion as art narrows its motive and its standard from the great universal ideals it becomes special and short-lived. If it accepts a purpose significant only to a certain people or a certain age, or expresses its message in a form of merely temporary or local value, it may win great influence at the time, but it cannot survive the time. That is, it cannot survive the time as art, though it may survive it as history. A great deal of the art of the past we cherish, not for the delight and inspiration it gives us, the proper function of art, but for the knowledge it gives us of peoples and epochs, the proper function of history. Even this kind of historical immortality is an honor worth striving for, and the utmost that rewards, as a rule, reputations great in their day.

With an artist of this class the purpose is to present life honestly as he sees it; and the value of his book or his picture is in direct proportion to

the largeness of his vision and the fineness of his touch. At the highest, his work is poetic—that is, beautifully and significantly true; at the lowest, it is journalistic—that is, true to fact, to sense. But in every case, with the authentic artist, it is true to the actual proportions of life. It does not twist human nature around a theory; it does not summon facts to the service of a cause. Its motive must be inherent, unconscious—the soul of a living being, not the motive power of a machine.

When one can feel in any so-called work of art a purpose pushing from without, instead of animating from within, the work is a treatise and its author a moralizer. The book may sell by the hundred thousand, may hasten the march of events or change the course of history; in economics, politics or morals it may accomplish the purpose of its author and bring him both power and praise, but it does not belong, even historically, to art. Mr. Allen, in enumerating novels with a purpose, has jumbled together the living things and the machines—*Jane Eyre* and *Robert Elsmere*, *Ghosts* and *The Heavenly Twins*. Apparently he does not perceive the fundamental difference between them.

Thus an artist's "purpose" has nothing to do with the case. The most laudable purpose cannot make a picture beautiful nor a novel readable The noble purpose of emancipating the slaves, to which *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was dedicated, cannot give that book the importance in literature which it must always have in history. On the other hand, a purpose no more strenuous than that of the birds, who sing for very love of life, cannot rob Burns's lyrics of immortality, nor lessen by one laurel leaf the glory of Whistler, the greatest painter of our time.

Indeed, nothing is more dangerous to the true artist than a special purpose. It enters his mind only to take possession, to make him, for the time at least, a man of one idea; to destroy the serenity and impartiality necessary to art. At once it distorts his vision and narrows his range, so that his service falls from the immaculate and infinite beauty to some ism or issue of the day. And in falling it fails; for not wings, but hands, must perform these heavier labors.

One must climb to the highest standpoint to achieve the broadest view. No theory, no purpose should beguile the artist from his outlook upon the infinite. Let him behold and express; there are millions to fight and toil.

HARRIET MONROE.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

THERE is no institution in this country which has been surrounded with a greater degree of sanctity than the Supreme Court of the United States. No other institution has attained such an honored prestige or dignity as this august tribunal. The fountain of justice, the supreme arbiter of constitutional principles, interpreting and administering laws with rigorous equality, without fear or favor, this court has, with few exceptions, been kept aloof from party strife, and has escaped the fluctuations incident to a change of administration. Its stability and firmness have been the source of its strength.

In the present campaign, however, one of the great political parties has avowed its purpose to make the Supreme Court subservient to legislative will, and, consequently, to partisan principles. The Democratic platform adopted at Chicago contains this declaration:

"Until the money question is settled we are opposed to any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in revenue caused by the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax. But for this decision by the Supreme Court there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by a Democratic Congress in strict pursuance of uniform decisions of that court for nearly 100 years, that court having in that decision sustained constitutional objections to its enactment which had previously been overruled by the ablest judges who have ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expenses of the government."

This declaration indicates a line of policy which, if carried into practical effect, would virtually undermine our constitutional government by destroying its greatest safeguard.

The Constitution of the United States is the Magna Charta of our civil and political liberties, the very foundation upon which our system of republican government is laid. The Supreme Court is the bulwark of the Constitution, and is absolutely essential to the maintenance of a stable federal government. It was wisely constituted as a check upon legislative enactments, or to make such enactments conform to the letter and spirit of the Constitution. It was intended to restrain party spirit, or popular prejudice, expressed in State or national legislatures, by subjecting the work of such bodies to the calm and dispassionate judgment of an independent and high-minded judicial tribunal.

The Democratic platform lays down doctrines which are utterly repugnant to the principles of constitutional government. It forecasts a dangerous innovation, a revolutionary spirit. It strikes at the very root of our system of government. It seeks to undermine an institution which has been the sheet anchor of our federal union, and is the mainstay of the republic. It seeks to nullify or reverse the work of the framers of the Constitution by making the federal legislature the supreme judge of the constitutionality of its acts, and to deprive the Supreme Court of that time-honored prerogative, and to reduce it to a mere creature of legislative will and subject it to the dangerous influence of party expediency or caprice. The Democratic platform seems to contemplate such legislation as will enable Congress to reverse or nullify the decrees of the Supreme Court, and thus defeat the very purpose for which this court was organized.

The Supreme Court, as the solemn interpreter and exponent of the Constitution, and the supreme arbiter of all questions between State or municipal bodies or persons, is greater than the National Government itself. Deprive it of its ancient and legitimate prerogative of deciding constitutional questions, and the Constitution itself will be fatally undermined.

An examination of the provisions under which the Supreme Court was organized and expanded will show how it might be made subject to legislative will and divested of its legitimate functions. The Constitution of the United States provides that "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is original and appellate. The original jurisdiction of this court

cannot be extended or limited by Congress. Such was the decision of this court in the case of Marbury v. Madison. But its appellate jurisdiction is subject to the Acts of Congress. Such jurisdiction is exercised "with such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make." A creature of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has been reared and disciplined by Congress, and may be swayed by the decisive action of that body. It may be compelled to enforce the Acts of Congress, whether constitutional or not, or it may be reduced to a mere impotent tribunal, like the Senate of Rome in the time of the later emperors. The Act of Congress establishing judicial courts of the United States, approved September 24, 1789, provided that the Supreme Court "shall consist of a chief justice and five associate justices." A sixth justice was appointed pursuant to the Act of February 24, 1807, and two additional justices were appointed under the Act of March 3, 1837. Subsequently, under the Act of March 3, 1863, the court was augmented by the addition of a ninth justice, and such is the status of the court at the present time.

In England, where Parliament is the popular legislative body, the House of Lords is regarded as a stumbling block in the way of constitutional government. To overcome an adverse majority in the House of Lords, where the passage of a measure was demanded by the weight of public sentiment, the government sometimes resorted to the practice of creating new peers in order to carry the measure through the House of Lords. An analogous practice has been resorted to in this country on several occasions to render the United States Supreme Court subservient to legislative will. This has been accomplished by increasing or decreasing the number of justices. The Supreme Court was decreased under the Act of July 23, 1866, passed over the veto of President Johnson, which reduced the number of justices to six, by providing that the existing vacancies should not be filled. This measure was intended to prevent President Johnson from appointing justices whose views might not be in harmony with the policy of the dominant party in Congress.

The practice of rendering the Supreme Court favorable to legislative measures by increasing its numbers was resorted to when the validity of the Legal Tender Acts was sought to be upheld. These Acts of Congress, of February 25, 1862, March 3, 1863, and July 11, 1863, provided for the issuing of Treasury notes, and declared that the same should be lawful money and a legal tender in payment of all debts, public or private, except in certain specified cases. The constitutionality of this legislation came up for consideration by the Supreme Court in Hepburn v. Griswold (8 Wallace, U. S. Reports, 603), and the Court in 1869 declared the acts unconstitutional. The Chief Justice and four associate justices declared against the acts, and three justices dissented. Then the practice of expanding the court was resorted to. The Act of Congress of April 10, 1869, approved by President Grant, provided that the Supreme Court should consist of a Chief Justice and eight associate justices. Mr. Justice Grier, who voted against the validity of the Legal Tender Acts, had resigned, so that, under the Act of April 10, 1869, there were two vacancies in the court which were filled by President Grant by the appointment of Mr. Justice Strong and Mr. Justice Bradley, February 7, 1870. The Supreme Court, as thus constituted, reconsidered the Legal Tender Acts, in the case of Knox v. Lee (12 Wallace, U. S. Reports, 457), and the case of Hepburn v. Griswold was overruled, and the validity of the Legal Tender Acts was sustained.

Another method of influencing the decisions or averting action by the Supreme Court consists in limiting or cutting off its jurisdiction, and this has been done by Congress, even in cases pending before the Court. The status and powers of the Supreme Court may, as we have seen, be determined by Congress, except in case of its original jurisdiction. After the civil war, a case arose in the South, under the reconstruction acts, which seemed likely to test the constitutionality of those acts. The subject of reconstruction in the South was a live one fraught with serious consequences of a national character, and the validity of the reconstruction acts was a question of great importance to the dominant party in Congress seeking to carry out a well-defined policy. This was the case of *ex parte* McCardle, reported in 6 Wallace, 318, and 7 Wallace, 506. The appellant was in the custody of a military commission organized pursuant to the reconstruction acts in the State of Mississippi. On his application, a writ of *habeas corpus* was issued by the United States Circuit Court, but, on the hearing thereon, he was remanded to the custody of the commission. He then appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and his case was considered by that court, but before it could, or did, pronounce judgment thereon, the authors of the reconstruction acts, fearing an adverse decision, repealed the provisions of the law which permitted appeals from the Circuit to the Supreme Court on *habeas corpus* cases, and deprived the latter court of jurisdiction on appeals then taken. The result of this strategic movement was to oust the Supreme Court from jurisdiction in the McCardle and kindred cases, and prevent it from rendering a decision on that case, already considered by it. The legislative provision depriving the Supreme Court of appellate jurisdiction in *habeas corpus* cases, *including cases then before it*, being retroactive in force, was no doubt unconstitutional, but still that court, yielding no doubt to strong political pressure, held that the act in question was valid.

Thus we have seen that the Supreme Court, although created and secured by the Constitution, is limited in its scope and action by the powers of Congress, and is capable of being made a subservient tool of any party having control of Congress and the Executive, or a sufficient majority in Congress, without the Executive, and that in practice, such power of interference with the free exercise of the legitimate functions of the court, or of limiting or nullifying its acts, has actually been exercised in several instances.

The declaration of the Democratic platform in respect to the Supreme Court is somewhat nebulous, but from the passage, "we declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the court, *as it may hereafter be constituted*, and the character and expressed sentiments of those who framed this declaration, we may safely assume that if the Democratic party, as at present constituted and dominated, acquires the opportunity, it will not hesitate to strip the Supreme Court of its honored prestige and prerogatives and degrade it to the position of a servient creature of the Executive or legislative department of the government. Indeed, the very declaration itself indicates the anarchistic tendency of the entire Democratic platform, or a spirit of repudiation of valid obligations, and an avowed purpose on the part of its authors so to constitute the Supreme Court as to enable them to foist upon the country a debased currency and to make the same legal tender for all obligations, regardless of the conditions attached thereto.

The separate existence of the Supreme Court, as an integral part of the federal government, and the unrestricted exercise of its lawful functions, is necessary in order to maintain a parity of power between the executive and legislative departments. It should operate as a check upon the legislative department in passing improper laws, and upon the executive in enforcing such laws, or committing unconstitutional acts. In England the sturdy independence and exalted patriotism of Coke and other judges in resisting the tyranny of Charles II. laid the foundation for an enlightened constitutional government in that country.

The maintenance of the integrity of the Supreme Court is necessary in order to preserve the public credit and a sound currency, because of the fluctuation of party views. It would be useless for Congress to pass a free silver bill if the Supreme Court could disannul it. Hence, the declaration in the Democratic platform of an intention to make the Supreme Court conform to legislative will.

Why was this government enabled during the Civil War to borrow immense sums of money upon its individual credit? Simply because of the confidence of lenders at home and abroad in the power and determination of the Supreme Court to enforce such obligations according to their tenor. The Supreme Court, when unhampered in the exercise of its functions, has rendered our money and our credit good in every country of the globe. This court has likewise maintained the inviolability of private contracts. Its decision in the famous Dartmouth College case disannulling an act of the New Hampshire Legislature which deprived the trustees of that institution of their lawful rights, firmly established the validity of the constitutional provision that private contracts shall not be impaired. Upon the strength and permanency of this and kindred decisions of the Supreme Court depend the stability of all tenures or titles, and the obligations of contracts.

The maintenance of the Supreme Court as an independent judicial body, and the full free exercise by it of the legitimate functions conferred upon it by the Constitution and laws, is absolutely essential to the perpetuation and growth of our free institutions, and the stability of our republican government.

GEORGE A. BENHAM.

AN ELECTRIC FARM.

IT was never supposed by the early experimenters with electricity that their subtile agent could ever be made of any practical value to the farmers, but in the light of recent discoveries almost anything seems possible, if not probable, in the application of this fluid. Electric plows have been patented in Vienna, and electric hay-rakes, reapers, carts, and threshing machines have been placed upon exhibition in this country, and their utility tested favorably. Experimental farms have been established where nearly all the work has been performed by means of this powerful agent—fields plowed, harrowed, fertilized, and rolled, seeds planted and covered with soil, plants fertilized and weeds killed, and crops harvested and threshed. The power has been generated by erecting a large turbine wheel on some stream where the current could be depended upon to turn it. The cost of manufacturing the electricity has been reduced to a comparatively small sum in this way, and the prospects of conducting our farms in the future on an electric basis seem alluring and attractive.

But the most noticeable application of electricity to farming methods

is that of employing the current to stimulate the growth of the plants. While nothing very practical has yet been accomplished in this field, the reports of the experiment farms and stations warrant one in believing that something definite may yet come out of all the labor and trouble expended. The electric garden may be a future novelty that will have for its chief recommendation a real practical utility.

Many years ago several European scientists made experiments with electricity upon plant life. Lemstrom in Finland, Spechneff in Southern Russia, and Celi in France, worked independently along the same line, applying the electric current to the seeds and the soil in which the plants were growing, and to the air immediately above the surface of the soil. Spechneff, by applying the electric current to the seeds and afterwards to the soil, raised radishes seventeen inches long and five and one-half inches in diameter. The colors of flowers were also intensified or changed according to the power and distance of the current, and the maturity of the plants was greatly hastened.

The first attempts to experiment along the lines of Lemstrom in this country were made at Cornell University about five years ago. Agricultural scientists had long recognized the valuable part that atmospheric electricity played in the life of vegetable growths, but the artificial application of it had never before been attempted. In addition to the application of electricity to the seeds of the plants, and to the soil, the experimenters at Cornell used the arc light at night. The plants receiving the bright electric rays at night, and the sunshine in the day time, were found to grow much faster than those not thus supplied with the artificial stimulant. Lettuce, spinach, radishes, and similar vegetables were brought to maturity in almost half the time ordinarily required. By applying the arc light direct to the plants their growth was so accelerated that many ran to seed before edible leaves were formed. Plants placed within five feet of the lamp died and wilted shortly after being taken out of the soil.

The effect upon flowering plants was almost as startling. The plants were made to shoot up rapidly, and under forced stimulation the stalks grew up tall, slender, and weak. The blooms were hastened in their growth, and in the case of the petunias they produced more flowers than by the old system. Verbenas, on the other hand, were uniformly injured when placed near the electric lamp. Both the leaves and the flowers were hastened in their growth, but they were small and insignificant, while many of the lower clusters died before they had reached their full expansion. The effect of the electric light upon colors was even more interesting than upon the growth of the plants. The colors of the tulips were deepened and made more brilliant, while most of the scarlet, dark red, blue, and pink flowers were turned to a grayish white. Nearly all of the flowers artificially stimulated into beauty by the electric light soon lost their brilliancy and faded much more quickly than those raised by Nature's methods.

An important part of the experiments that have been made along this line is that the crops that were not injured by the electric lights were nearly twice as large as those not exposed to the influence of the current. Lemstrom, in trying to measure the influence of the current upon growing wheat and vegetables, procured fifty per cent. more grains from a small tract of ground that was planted with a small network of wires than from a similar plot of soil not thus stimulated.

Experiments have been continued with more or less regularity at Cornell

since these first discoveries, and it is probable that we will yet be able to attain the results long anticipated by agricultural scientists. Some plants have been found to have such a fondness for the electric light that they not only grow faster under its influence, but incline their heads toward the lamp. Others are injured rather than benefited, and they lose all of their valuable qualities after being exposed to the arc lights for a few nights. The question of softening the light of the lamps to suit the different plants has been in the course of investigation, and now globes of "opal" glass are used to reduce the power of the rays. An amber-colored globe is usually employed at Cornell, for the orange rays are supposed to be the most favorable to the growth of vegetation. The various effect of the different colored rays of light upon the vegetation is strange and interesting to those experimenting with the electric light.

It is doubted by many whether the arc light can be made as efficacious as the electric current supplied through wires to the soil. Lemstrom obtained his most wonderful results by this latter method, and the plants were injured less by it than many that have been subjected to the electric lights.

Four years ago it was currently reported that a market gardener named Rawson, living in the town of Arlington, Mass., had used the electric lights to profitable advantage. His attention was called to the effect of electric light upon plants in 1889, when the town of Arlington began to light the streets with electricity. One of the powerful lights was located near his garden so that its rays fell directly upon a bed of flowers. These plants, situated within the circuit of the light, immediately began to grow rapidly and vigorously, outstripping all others in the garden. Satisfying himself that the cause of this was the electric light, the gardener had set up in his large hothouse a lamp of the same kind. After one or two season's trial he found that he could raise more winter lettuce and radishes in a given space in much shorter time by using the arc lights, the incandescent burners not proving so suitable, while the quality was much superior. His profits were estimated to have been increased twenty-five to forty per cent. by introducing the arc lights into his greenhouse.

This was but another confirmation of the tests made before that in Europe, and later on at Cornell. Now it seems that the French scientists have been working regularly and systematically on the question also, and they have recently obtained some results that are promising. The French electric garden is more successful than any established in this country. An instrument is used to bring into play the electricity in the air, cheapening the process of supplying the current to the plants. At the present cost of generating electricity, it is doubtful if its use could be made profitable upon many farms, even though it should greatly stimulate the growth and quality of fruits and vegetables. The French instrument is supposed to reduce the cost of generation so that every farmer could avail himself of it.

The system consists of laying a network of wires in the garden where the plants are growing, and connecting them with a copper wire that runs to the top of a pole some forty to fifty feet high. This pole is surmounted by a collector, insulated by a porcelain knob. The height of the pole enables the collector to gather the electricity in the atmosphere from a wide area, and when transmitted to the garden through the wires it produces better results than the electricity generated from a dynamo. The atmospheric electricity is not by any means as strong as that from a dynamo, but its action is to stimulate the plants without injuring them.

Gardens that have been stimulated by the atmospheric electricity, gathered and distributed by the geomagnetifere, have increased their growth and products 50 per cent. Vineyards have been experimented upon, and the grapes produced have not only been larger in size and quantity, but richer in sugar and alcohol. The flowers have attained a richer perfume, and more brilliant colors. The effect on the whole has been very satisfactory, and it is hopefully expected by the French scientists that the new method of applying atmospheric electricity to plants will greatly facilitate our plants in their future growth. Nearly all of the garden vegetables grew with astonishing rapidity when stimulated by the electric current, applied first to the seeds, and subsequently to the soil in which they germinated.

It is difficult to explain the reason why the electric light or current so marvellously affects the growth of plants, but the fact that such stimulation does occur cannot be denied. One theory is that the electricity helps the plants to take up and assimilate certain valuable salts in the earth, and another that it aids them in appropriating more nitrogen of the air. Atmospheric electricity supplied naturally plays an important part in the economy of plant growth, and it has been simply a desire to test its further effect that scientists have been induced to make the experiments. Now, however, it is possible that a practical utility may be derived from the tests conducted in this and other countries.

It would be difficult to conceive the ultimate effect upon our industrial and economic life if electric gardens could be successfully established by farmers, and the yield increased fifty per cent. The product of our farms and gardens would thus be doubled, and the world's supply of food stuff be increased beyond the point of consumption, or the acreage would rapidly decrease. The profits to the farmers would not by any means be doubled. The cost of installing an electric garden would form an item of expense that they do not calculate with to-day. The cost of a dynamo or battery would be beyond their reach, but if the electricity of the atmosphere could be collected and distributed in the garden there would be some hope of their securing the current necessary for all purposes.

The use of electricity on the future model farm will be far greater than it is to-day, and it is not impossible that the horse will be crowded out of his legitimate work in this field as he has been on the city car lines. An experimental farm to show the use of this power in cultivating the fields has been established in the West. The electricity is generated by a turbine wheel, which is turued by the current of a small stream dammed up for the purpose, and the cost of the power is reduced to a minimum. Sufficient power is generated by the wheel to light the whole place, and to run the threshing machines, plow the fields, harvest the crops, and run motor bicycles or wagons anywhere within the limits of the farm. A large Western farm, consisting of thousands of acres, with a good stream of water flowing through it, could probably be conducted on a cheaper scale to-day than by steam. In fact, the owners of some of the large farms are eagerly watching the development of electric locomotion, and as soon as experiments justify their actions the steam plow, reaper, thresher, and rakes will be supplanted by those run by electricity.

GEORGE ETHELBERT WALSH.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXX.

NOVEMBER, 1896.

THE EFFECT OF REPUBLICAN VICTORY.

BY THE HON. T. C. PLATT.

THE Presidential campaign of 1896 has no parallel in American history. It has been likened to the Grant-Greeley campaign of 1872. Party lines in 1872 were broken, but there was nothing like the general demoralization in political circles that year that has characterized the present campaign. In 1872 the Democratic party went on a strike against Horace Greeley. The members of that party showed their hostility to Greeley by refusing to vote. General Grant in 1872 received, comparatively, very few Democratic votes.

This year we have the spectacle presented of hundreds and thousands of independent Democrats who publicly proclaim their intention of voting for the Republican candidate. These men have placed country above party, and they are entitled to the highest credit for their patriotic stand in this crisis.

There has been no more important election in this country since the war; in fact, the issues involved in the campaign which is now drawing to a close are of more vital concern than any that have ever been raised since the foundation of the Republic. The honor and credit of the nation have been assailed, and unless both are vindicated in such a manner as to admit of no room for doubt, the safety of our institutions and the existence of the

Copyright, 1896, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

nation itself will be in danger. It is the imperative duty of the hour to crush out Bryanism and all that it represents.

It is not strange, therefore, that party lines, for the time being, have been practically obliterated. Horace Greeley once said that it was not true that every Democrat was a horse thief, but it was undoubtedly a fact that every horse thief was a Democrat. There may be, and no doubt there are, many honest, sincere, but misguided men who are supporting Mr. Bryan; but it is also true that Mr. Bryan numbers among his followers 99 per cent. of the dishonest people of the country; the men who are enemies to society and have no interest in the preservation of this country as a nation; whom any change could not injure, as they have nothing to lose, neither character nor worldly goods. In a word, Mr. Bryan is supported with apparent unanimity by all that is vicious and debased among our population.

It may be advanced, for the sake of argument, that this is not Mr. Bryan's fault. Granted. But no man has ever succeeded in making himself any greater or any better than his party; and it is not at all likely that Mr. Bryan, young and inexperienced as he is, can hope to succeed where older and abler men have failed. If elected, Mr. Bryan would give the country just the kind of administration that the people who elected him would demand. He would be powerless to do anything different. He must at least do his best to carry out the revolutionary theories of the Chicago platform, and nothing could be worse.

Thoughtful people have perceived the approach of the storm which was brought to a culmination at Chicago last July. They have recognized that sooner or later there must be fought a fight between law and order, honesty and honor, on the one hand, and lawlessness and repudiation on the other. It is not necessary to go into a discussion at this time as to what has contributed to bring about the conditions which exist to-day; but it is well, perhaps, that the issues involved in this campaign should be met now fairly and squarely, and settled once for all; because, until they are settled and settled in the right way, this country can hope to make but little progress. Agitation means uncertainty, and uncertainty at the present juncture would be almost as bad as Bryanism itself.

It is very fortunate for the Republican party and for the country that the St. Louis Convention came out boldly and took a clear

stand in favor of the gold standard. Any other course would have been fatal to the Republican party, and consequently disastrous to the country. Any attempt at equivocation, or at "straddling" the financial issue which the whole country recognized then must be the paramount issue of the campaign, would have left the party of great moral ideas in a very awkward predicament. Populists and Popocrats and other advocates of repudiation would have been able to point to the Republican platform as at least a partial endorsement of their position. The party would not have gained a single Populist or Popocrat vote, and would have forfeited the votes and confidence of thousands of Republicans and independent Democrats.

The Republican party has always stood for sound money, and there was not the slightest reason why the St. Louis Convention should not say so in plain terms.

The election of McKinley and Hobart upon the St. Louis platform will settle the financial policy of this country for the next generation at least. The verdict will be so emphatic in my judgment that, during the lifetime of all those who are on earth to-day, no man or no party will be found bold enough to go before the people advocating doctrines which mean repudiation. I have such an abiding faith in the sturdy good sense and sound patriotism of the mass of the people of this country that I cannot for a moment entertain the slightest doubt of the triumph of the Republican party at the coming Presidential election. Vermont and Maine have spoken, and as those two States have in the past been political barometers, foreshadowing the result in November, there can be but one opinion among the thinking people on this subject. Vermont and Maine have pointed the way; New York and the States of the North and West, and I trust several of those of the South that have been emancipated from the iron chains of political bigotry which have enthralled them for so many years, will show to the nation and to the world that this country does not intend to indorse repudiation and turn the government over to the freebooters of the free silver madness.

The election of McKinley will settle many things. It will clear the air; it will be the beginning of a new era in the development of this country. The nightmare of Populism, Anarchy, and Socialism will have been banished, and will not return to trouble our sleep in the future.

The country has passed through a fearful period during the past four years. It has been an experience to try the souls of men, and make one almost lose faith in the ever-watchful care of Divine Providence.

Millions of dollars have been lost and there has been almost a complete stagnation in every line of business.

The return of prosperity will not be sudden. A man who has been stricken with a serious disease and laid up for a long time does not arise at once and go forth a strong man. He must return to health and strength gradually, if at all; and so it is with the nation that has been through, or has endured, the financial strain which we have suffered. We cannot expect to regain all that we have lost, or any considerable part of it, in a day; but, bad as our condition has been, it would in its worst and most acute stage pass for prosperity in comparison to what would occur should Mr. Bryan be elected. The election of McKinley is absolutely necessary to the restoration of prosperity, and for the preservation of our institutions.

But the election of McKinley and the loss of the House of Representatives would be most unfortunate. The loss of the House of Representatives to the Republican party at this juncture would offset, to a considerable extent, the beneficial effect of the election of the Republican candidates for President and Vice-President.

We must not only elect McKinley and Hobart, but secure control, if possible, of both branches of Congress. I believe that we shall do this, and that the verdict of the American people at the polls on the 3d of November next will be all that the most patriotic and loyal citizen of this nation could desire.

T. C. PLATT.

INFLUENCE OF THE COLLEGE IN AMERICAN LIFE.

BY PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, D.D., LL.D., WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY AND ADELBERT COLLEGE.

THE American college has rendered a service of greater value to American life in training men than in promoting scholarship. It has affected society more generally and deeply through its graduates than through its contributions to the sciences. Its work for America and for the world has been done at second-hand through the men whom it has educated. It has been rather a mother of men than a nurse of scientists.

In judging of the value of the service which the college has rendered to society through its sons, of course one must not be guilty of claiming too much. The college is only one of the factors which help to develop the character and the working power of an individual. The home, personal association, environment, and native ability are always to be weighed and assessed. Many men "of light and leading" would still have been guides of their fellows even if they had never gone to college. Yet the college has rendered unique and peculiarly rich services. It has in nearly every instance increased ability, and made ability more efficient. It has rendered indifferent ability good, good better, and given a superlative excellence to that of a higher degree.

Of all the professions, the ministry enrolls the largest proportion of college graduates. An examination of Dr. Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit* shows that of the eleven hundred and seventy clergymen therein named, 74 per cent. of those who are Episcopalian, 78 per cent. of those who are Presbyterian, 80 per cent. of those who are Congregational, and 97 per cent. of those who are Unitarian clergymen are graduates. The influence of the minister in a

community is, in a degree, the influence of the college and that influence has been from the birth of the nation great. In the very beginning the minister was the autocrat, both civil and social, of the commonwealth. He has now ceased to be an autocrat, but his influence continues strong and pervasive. Of all the members of the community he is the only one who has the opportunity of speaking to the people at frequent and regular intervals upon important questions. The decline of the lyceum system has left him practically alone in the forum of public debate. If he give to his functions a large interpretation, he finds himself closely related to all the higher concerns of humanity. He is, above most citizens, interested and influential in the public-school system. He is the arbiter upon many questions of social and civil relationships. In all sociological concerns his counsel may be of great value. Above most persons in the community, he is a scholar. Aside, therefore, from his purely professional relations, the clergyman is or may be of great influence. In all instances the college has trained in him qualities which at least greatly enlarge his field of usefulness and enrich his power of service. In the rural parish as well as in the urban his influence is greater because he has had four years in college. The power of the clergyman, therefore, is the power of the college.

The colleges have ceased to be, as several of the earlier colleges were designed in their foundations to be, training schools for the ministry. The callings of the law and of commercial life are now more attractive to the graduates of certain colleges. But the college has not yet lost its prestige as being the most valuable opportunity for the men who propose to be ministers to fit themselves for their work, be their number small or large. Under a government in which the state and the church and the college are more normally and generally united than these agencies are in the United States, the college usually represents a necessary condition to the assuming of clerical functions. The Church of England would have lost its power, and the minister in that church his influence, if Oxford and Cambridge had not existed. Writing to Mr. Gladstone, in 1854, Dean Burgon referred to Oxford and her colleges as "those fortresses where the Church has ever nursed her warriors, and whither she has never turned in vain for a champion in her hour of need." The English Church commands the respect of those

whose respect is most worth commanding, largely through the contributions of manifold sorts which the English universities have made to it. In America it is significant that the churches which have been most influential in the development of American life have been those which have placed greatest emphasis upon the worth of a college-bred ministry. It is also evident that as the churches themselves have attached greater or less importance to the necessity of a college training for their ministers, has their influence increased or diminished. At the time when the Methodist Church did not regard a college training as desirable for securing ordination, the influence of that church was small. Only 11 per cent. of the Methodist clergymen named in Dr. Sprague's volumes are graduates. But at the present time, when the Methodist Church regards a liberal education as a valuable element in the clergyman's equipment, the public influence of this church is greatly increasing.

The large majority of the lawyers of the United States are not college-bred; but it is not too much to say that the influence of those who are is greater than that of the remainder who are not. The highest positions in the courts of the United States, or in the courts of the individual States, are usually filled by those who have had an academic education. Every Chief Justice of the United States has been a college graduate except one; and that one, John Marshall, was a student at the College of William and Mary until the outbreak of the Revolution interrupted his undergraduate career. More than two-thirds of the associate judges of the Supreme Court and about two-thirds of the present Circuit Court judges are college graduates. At the present time every member of our Supreme Court has received a liberal education. Conspicuously among the professions, the law demands the power of applying fundamental principles to the solution of complex problems. Every case submitted to a lawyer represents an opportunity for an application of the law of rights. The lawyer, therefore, should have clearness of mental vision, a thorough understanding of principles, facility in the application of these principles, and above all else the power of analysis. No better means for developing such powers exists than the college.

Our great system of public education is a sphere in which the influence of the college is not usually recognized. It is often supposed that the teacher in the primary, or grammar, or high

school, is jealous of the college professor and that the college professor has a contempt for the school teacher. But what is called the lower and what is called the higher education are but two parts of one great scheme, each ministering unto, and each receiving ministry from, the other. If the work in the primary grades be slovenly, superficial, weak, the teaching in higher grades is also slovenly, superficial, weak, and ineffective. If the college fail to be effective, strong, inspiring, wholesome, all the education that comes before the college period falls into methods of narrowness and superficiality. The kindergarten is a preparation for the physical laboratory, and the physical and psychological laboratories of the college have close relations to the kindergarten.

Historically the college has had a great influence in the development of our educational system. Harvard College was founded eleven years before the passage of the law requiring those towns in the Bay Colony having one hundred families to be able to fit students for college. It was a graduate of Brown University who became the founder of Antioch College, who did the greatest work for the common schools ever done by any American. Massachusetts and every commonwealth owe a lasting debt of gratitude to Horace Mann. The educational system of Indiana is the product of the influence of Caleb Mills, who for many years was a professor in Wabash College. At the present time the college, and especially the college in the West, is doing a great work in upholding the higher standards of the public-school system. The forces that are constantly trying to pull down these standards are tremendous. The tendency of the age to reach practical results by the shortest pathways carries along with itself the peril of ethical and intellectual superficiality. Against this tendency the college stands firm as the everlasting hills. Although only a small proportion of the teachers of the United States are college-trained, yet many of them have been taught by those who are college-trained. They have felt the inspiration of the motives, and have been affected in a measure by the character, of those who have been inspired themselves by college ideals, moved by college motives and influenced by college conditions. The superintendents and supervisors of many schools are college graduates, as are the teachers in many high schools. Therefore, not a few students who are obliged to finish their education with the high school

have received an influence from the college at one remove. Even beyond the personal influence, the college system, as a system, has touched the public-school system. It has held before the schools standards of learning, larger in content, and higher in aim, than the schools could themselves create.

The college, further, has embodied a broad and noble patriotism. This patriotism has been free from provincialism. The college has interpreted "country," not as representing square miles of territory or loyalty to a partisan government, but as meaning justice for all, helpfulness toward the worthy or the weak, sympathy for the oppressed and opportunity for the working out of noblest results under favorable conditions. It has sought that just government might prevail; that toleration of opinions might become common. It has endeavored to incarnate the cardinal virtues in the state. No youth has been more eager than the college youth to doff the student's gown and to don the soldier's uniform. It has been said that, except for Harvard College, the Revolution would have been put off half a century. Of the great war no stories are more moving, no tales of valor more splendid than those told of the college boys who became soldiers. It is significant that in the petition for the granting of the charter of Union College a hundred years ago, attention is called to the need in the young Republic of men qualified to lead in the state as well as in the church; and Union College, be it said, has furnished a great number of men who have rendered efficient service to the nation. The constitution of North Dakota was partly the work of a graduate of a college in Wisconsin. Of the men who have been influential in the affairs of Rhode Island in the last century and a half, only three can be mentioned who have not been graduates of Brown University, and these three were connected with the university in such a way as to feel its influence. The motto of the college graduate is not "My country, right or wrong." Rather he loves his country, and is willing to die or live for it, as it embodies those principles which represent eternal and infinite relationships. He loves his country more because he loves the world much. The college has, moreover, rendered great service in upholding the ideas of a simple democracy. The college is, along with the public school, the most democratic of our institutions. It exists for the people. If the college is a part of

the system of public education, it exists as a part of the commonwealth. If it is a private corporation, it is private in no sense other than that it represents private property held in trust for public weal. The ordinary college represents the bestowment of a large amount of property for the improvement of the people. It embodies the power of promoting scholarship as a means for the elevation of humanity. The principles dominant in the college are principles of our common citizenship. It is not wealth nor birth, prestige nor family, which opens the doors of the college, but it is the simple desire to use the facilities offered by the college for the enlargement and enrichment of character and of life. The college finds its best conditions in a democratic community. But the college in turn tends to develop democracy in the community. The English universities failed for centuries to have a worthy influence in English life because of ecclesiasticism. The American college is the creation of the democratic commonwealth. The American college in turn tends to make the democratic commonwealth yet more democratic. It is still true, as the late President Anderson said in an address given at the time of his inauguration forty-two years ago: "Universities have been everywhere the nurseries of equality. The single fact that for centuries their endowments gave to the sons of the poor their only available opportunity to measure their strength with the rich and noble on equal terms, shows that they have had more influence in giving to man a superiority over his accidents than any institution except the Christian Church. Universities have been the special benefactors of the poor. We believe that accurate statistics would show that more than two-thirds of the students who in our country have gone through a course of collegiate education, have been the sons of men in comparative poverty. To these has the main benefit of the university endowments inured. These conditions alone have prevented the monopoly of education from being secured to the rich."*

The story of the political or public achievements wrought by the American college for the community through its graduates is a long and glorious one. It is worth while possibly to present a few statistics. In suggesting the great part which college men have played in national affairs, it is

* Papers and addresses of Martin B. Anderson, volume 1, pages 44-5.

not unworthy to mention that clergymen, teachers, and physicians are by their occupations usually prevented from entering political life. The proportion, therefore, of college men who are found rendering conspicuous service to the nation becomes exceedingly significant. Of the fifty-six signers of the Declaration of Independence, forty-two had a liberal education. Three members of the committee of five appointed to draft the Declaration—Jefferson, Adams, and Livingston—were college-bred. At least thirty-five of the fifty-five men who composed the Convention of 1787, which framed the Constitution, had had the advantage of a classical education. The men who were most influential in the struggle which resulted in the adoption of the Constitution were men trained at college. Of our Presidents, fifteen are college graduates; and thirteen also of the Vice-Presidents. An examination of the biographical sketches of Congressmen proves that one-half of those who have served in the United States Senate have been college-trained, and somewhat more than one-third of those who have been members of the House of Representatives. When one considers the relatively small proportion of the citizens of this country who have been members of its colleges in the last hundred years—about three hundred thousand—the influence of the college men in the whole community is proved to be commanding.

The American college has given to the American people a discipline more thorough, a scholarship richer, and a culture finer than they otherwise could have received. I use these words discipline, scholarship, and culture not without discrimination. The college has trained men to think—to think for themselves and to think for others. Such training is usually obtained within the first two years of the course. It is the result of pursuing the mathematical, linguistic, and scientific studies. These studies are a first-rate gymnastic for the student; they produce intellectual strength. The college using them becomes a drill master, and the student having the advantage of the discipline given through them becomes keen and broad in vision, swift and constant to infer, true and impressive in applying and using. Such advantages are the best results of what we now call the old New England country college, and indeed of the college, be it new or old, whether within New England or without.

If the chief value of the services of the American college lies in the training of men, we are yet to bear in mind that the college has been the greatest of all contributors to scholarship. If we must confess—as indeed we must—that the American college has not achieved in scholarship what it has in discipline, or what the English universities and German have achieved, yet it is to be affirmed that whatever scholarship we may claim has found in the college its fostering mother. Many, though by no means all, of the advances which have been made in our knowledge of the laws of nature have been made under the patronage of the college, even if they have not been directly made by its officers. Most of the researches into the condition of early races of this country or of the Latin and Greek peoples, or of the natives of the far East, have found in the college their chief supporters and leaders. Archæological museums are usually organized in connection with colleges. Our acquaintance with the literature of the Roman and Greek peoples—the two peoples which, together with the Hebrew, have most vitally affected modern civilization—is derived largely through the college. Without the college, scholarship would be bereft of its most useful agency and its most healthful condition. The American scholar has usually, though by no means always, been an officer in the American college. The college library has been his workshop, the college laboratory his tool, the college desk his pulpit, and in the name and prestige of the college he has found a presumption in his own behalf as a scholar. Should one choose to mention the ten Americans who have contributed most largely to the progress of natural and physical science, eight of the ten would be found enrolled in the faculties of our colleges. The greatest American linguists, as well as the greatest American mathematicians, our greatest philosophers and psychologists, and several of our ablest economists and historians are found as teachers in our colleges.

The American college has possibly done more in laying foundations for culture than in directly cherishing culture ; for the American college has been so deeply concerned with the primary disciplines that it has found little opportunity for affording to its students means and methods of the deepest enrichment. But it has given impulses ; it has awakened aspirations ; it has put before the student standards of taste ; it has trained intellectual judgment; it has given to the great law of right a new

value by showing the breadth of its application and the height of its reach; it has sought to create a refinement which is purchased neither by the elimination of robustness nor by the introduction of over-critical æstheticism; it has tried to train each man to love the best in literature, in music, in painting, in nature, in humanity; and it has striven constantly to cause the student to distinguish in everything, not simply the good from the bad, but, what is far more difficult, the better from the best.

This service of the American college in training men to live intellectual lives is of the greatest worth to this country and to this age. For, in this age and country of materialism, the college should minister to the things of the mind. The college should not directly attempt to stem the tide of materialism. The attempt would be useless. But the college may worthily hope to transmute the capacity for this material enthusiasm, even if not the enthusiasm itself, into a capacity for holding and delighting in relations which are eternal, spiritual, and ethical.

When one attempts to estimate the value of the college as a means of promoting literature, the task is, at first thought, a difficult one. For in any list of the writers of any one time and place, the number of college-trained men would not be found to exceed the number of those who have not received a college training; but when one passes out into the relations of a century and of a whole nation, the difficulty vanishes. It seems, of course, a rule of thumb to judge of the worth of the contribution which the college makes to literature through the number of authors it has trained, or even through the greatness of these authors. But the method has value. Of course, in general, the great worth of the contribution which the college makes to literature is to be measured by the extent to which the college maintains literary standards, inspires literary motives, and by the degree in which it cherishes literary atmospheres and conditions. And it may at once be said that the large number of the great authors of the country are college-bred. The inference is inevitable that the college has had a large share in the creation of literature. It would be generally acknowledged that of the five or six men who are regarded by common suffrages as the greatest poets of America, four out of the five, or five out of the six, are college-trained. No one also would hesitate to say that of the five greatest historians of America, all are also college-trained. It

is significant, too, that they are all the sons of one mother. The first romancer, Hawthorne, and the first essayist, Emerson, are the sons of New England colleges. The great writers upon philosophical, ethical, and theological subjects represent with hardly an exception an academic training. In the large relations of time, it is the author of college training and enlargement who is recognized as the ablest and best. In England, the same condition, and even more signally, obtains. As one reads the biographies of her great authors, one seldom fails to find references to Cambridge, the mother of great men, or to Oxford, her sister, the mother of great movements.

America has made great contributions to the higher civilization of the world, but these contributions have usually been indirect. But she has made none more valuable than are found in the missionary movements of the Christian Church. These movements have been genuine and large endeavors for the establishing of a high type of civilization in countries not so richly blessed as our own. They represent the elements of the finest civilization. They include the teaching of the principles and the example of the monogamous family, the worship of one God, the institution of schools and colleges, the creation of a written language, and, to some extent, of a literature. Missionaries have reduced to writing some seventy languages, twenty-six of which are to be put to the credit of an American missionary society. In all these languages, a literature is either beginning, or is already somewhat advanced. Such labors represent linguistic and literary triumphs of a rare and exceedingly high order. And at once it is to be said that these missionaries who have been the bearers of civilization to South Sea Islanders and to degraded peoples in all parts of the globe, have, with few exceptions, found their most valuable training for this great service in the American college. It has been and is the policy of the foreign missionary boards to send to the lowest people the best-trained college man or woman. The American college, therefore, represents the greatest and most direct work which America has done for the world. The American college of poverty, of meagre equipment, of few teachers, as well as the mighty university of prestige, of eminence, of wealth, of vast numbers, has had a share in this magnificent service.

CHARLES F. THWING.

WHAT THE COUNTRY IS DOING FOR THE FARMER.

BY W. S. HARWOOD.

VAST as has been the progress of the United States in manufactures, in commerce, in invention, and the like, there is perhaps no branch of our national life which has shown more immense advancement in the past thirty years than that of agriculture. As the century closes, agriculture is rising from the obscurity of the years. It long since passed the stage of empiricism and is entering more broadly than ever upon a sensibly scientific career.

There was a time—it is within the memory of many now living—when the only essentials in agriculture were that the farmer should buy his seed, plant, till, and reap. Indeed, there are wide regions yet where tillers of the soil still labor under the delusion that a man who has failed in all other lines may be successful in agriculture, that it requires no education, no preparation, no knowledge of science to be a successful farmer. The fact that so great a portion of our national domain in the Central West has been blessed with a soil of prodigal productiveness has led men, all unconscious of the real conditions of affairs, to place no confidence in anything but the soil's fertility, to accept failures of crops as unavoidable visitations of Providence, to ignore the aid which science stands ready to give all who will accept it.

But the patient, ignorant man who planted wheat year in and year out on soil that had become exhausted, who tried to raise corn on soil which was never intended for it, who never gave a thought to the rotation of crops other than to laugh at the suggestion, who went steadily forward through a succession of failures with a tenacity which would have been heroic were it not so pitiably stupid, this farmer, sad figure that he was, is passing; and in his place there comes the man who has learned that to be

a successful farmer in the broad sense he must have education, he must rely upon science, he must fit himself liberally for his occupation. The instances where men have been densely ignorant of the rudimental elements of farming and yet have succeeded are so few that their existence serves to be valuable only as a proof of the generosity of the soil they have cultivated.

It has been the writer's fortune to be more or less intimately in touch with the work of one of the leading agricultural colleges and experiment stations of the United States for the last four or five years. In studying the scope of this dual institution, which is but a type of a large number now to be found in the United States, it has been manifest at every step that two dominant principles ruled. They may be stated in this wise :

1. The education to be given a young man from a farm should be such that he will be able to go back to the farm fitted to take up the actual work of the farm from the standpoint of an enlightened, educated, scientific workman.

2. That nothing should be taught with a view of leading him to forsake the farm at graduation, but that every possible influence should be brought to bear to cause his return to the farm as a preferred place for his life work.

In considering somewhat the importance of the agricultural advancement of the century, the influence of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations must be taken into consideration as an all-important factor. To the State of Michigan is due the credit of establishing the first agricultural college in the United States for the education of young men in the essentials of scientific agriculture. And yet this institution, the first of its kind in a country of vast agricultural possibilities, was not established until the year 1857. The progress thereafter in other States was slow and hesitating. The upheaval of the War of the Rebellion did much, North as well as South, to disturb the movement set on foot in Michigan. While the need of education for farmers was becoming more and more imperative, it required something more definite than anything which had preceded to crystallize public sentiment. In the midst of the Civil War the passage of the Morrill bill establishing what were termed land-grant colleges for the purposes of agricultural education, was not an act attracting great public attention; but when the war was over the wisdom of the provisions of this measure—now well known to the public

—became apparent and the agricultural colleges began springing up all over the land.

There are now agricultural colleges, or those other universities or colleges having agricultural courses which come under the provisions of the Morrill bill and reap its benefits, in every State and Territory in the Union, and in every section but Alaska.

Perhaps even more important in some ways in the wide growth of agricultural education in the last twenty years than these agricultural colleges are the experiment stations established, as a rule, in connection with the colleges and supported by government funds. Director A. C. True, of the Office of Experiment Stations of the United States Department of Agriculture, defines an experiment station as an institution in which scientific and practical investigations are made with a view to improving the methods of agriculture or introducing new crops or industries, the primary object being to apply scientific principles and methods to the problems of agriculture.

The first agricultural experiment station in the world was established within the last half-century, a product of German thought. This station was established near to the city of Leipsic, at a little town named Moeckern, by a number of intelligent farmers who were anxious to make use of the aid of science in conducting their farms. This was in 1851, and since that time about three hundred similar stations have been established in the world, broader in their scope and wider in their possibilities than the humble gathering of German farmers, but no more true to the demands of a higher agricultural education. Connecticut established the first experiment station in the United States in 1875, and there are now forty-six stations in the United States, several of which have sub-stations for the carrying on of field experimental work. Each station receives the sum of $15,000 per annum from the general government for its maintenance, and there are various bequests from private individuals and from individual States increasing this amount handsomely in some instances. It requires about eight hundred thousand dollars per year to pay the expenses of the stations.

The act of Congress establishing this important system of agricultural experimentation outlines the object and duty of the stations as follows:

"To conduct original researches or verify experiments on the

physiology of plants and animals—the diseases to which they are severally subject, with the remedies for the same ; the chemical composition of useful plants at their different stages of growth ; the comparative advantages of rotative cropping as pursued under a varying series of crops ; the capacity of new trees or plants for acclimation ; the analysis of soils and waters ; the chemical composition of manures, natural or artificial, with experiments designed to test their comparative effects on crops of different kinds ; the adaptation and value of forage plants and grasses ; the composition and digestibility of the different kinds of foods for domestic animals ; the scientific and economic questions involved in the production of butter and cheese; and such other researches or experiments bearing directly on the agricultural industry of the United States as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States and Territories."

This, of course, is a more or less perfunctory outline of the duties of these institutions. It is hardly possible to mention a department of modern agriculture into which the experimental work has not been carried to a large, a practical, and a commercially satisfactory conclusion.

In the colleges which aid in the present-day diffusion of the knowledge of scientific agriculture there are extended courses of study, embracing investigation into almost every science in the curriculum, while the original investigation carried on by the professors and the advanced students in the coördinate work of the experiment stations in connection with the colleges, affords an admirable opportunity for putting into practical form the theoretical knowledge of the books as well as giving an impetus to still more extended original investigation.

One is bewildered when one comes to a consideration of the practical results of the investigation of these experiment stations and of the teaching and investigation of the agricultural colleges. In every portion of the country, whatever be the product of the particular location, the scientific educator and experimenter of the last twenty years has been able to protect the farmer from ravages by injurious insects, to teach him how to conserve the products of his soil, to help him to enhance the value of the products of his labor. Let me give an instance or two coming under my own observation.

In the great wheat regions of the Central West, particularly in that portion of the Mississippi Valley embraced in the States of Minnesota and North and South Dakota, millions of dollars worth of wheat have been destroyed in the past years by the devastation of the chinch bug. Various kinds of preventives were used with greater or less success, but they were not eradicators; they were makeshifts. Scientific investigators in various experiment stations began experiments looking to the cultivation of a particular bacillus or spore that constituted a disease from which the chinch bug was sure to die. Healthy bugs were collected, dusted with the disease which had been cultivated on some of the various mediums suitable for its growth, and the artificially contaminated bugs were scattered among the healthy ones. The result, even on a moderate scale of treatment showed a rapid distribution of the disease among the healthy bugs. Further experiments carried on in the summer of 1895, and under way in the summer of 1896, indicate clearly that the end of this scourge is at hand. It has been demonstrated that, if the farmers, to whom the disease is sent in closed glass jars, will do their part in intelligently following the instructions of the station experts, the danger from a pest which has worked enormous havoc is practically at an end.

In the institution of which I have spoken the instructor in the veterinary department some two years ago began investigation into the use of tuberculin as a test for consumption, or tuberculosis, in cattle. He selected some of the choicest cattle on the station farm—cattle of various important strains of blood. The use of tuberculin as a test or as a curative in human beings had been checked by apparent failures; but this investigator, believing there was virtue in the tuberculin, began his series of experiments with vigor and scientific sense. He found a large percentage of the high-bred home herd of cattle responsive to the test. Some of the animals were killed and the inerrancy of the tuberculin shown in all cases. Others, shown to be diseased by the unfailing symptom of rising temperature after treatment, were isolated and treated for several months in a manner original with the instructor, the results showing remarkable curative powers. Some of the animals which had been shown to be highly consumptive were killed after some months of treatment and the diseased tissues were found to be largely healed. Investigations in the same

and other schools now under way indicate that ere long there will be a complete cure assured in a large percentage of the cattle found diseased. The veterinarian in point has treated herds of dairy cattle in all portions of his State, and the tuberculin under his hand has proven effective in discovering tuberculous cattle in at least 98 per cent. of the cases. The result has been that all those things which have been inimical to the health of the cattle—as poor ventilation, filthy stabling, innutritious food, all tending to promote tuberculosis—are now being remedied ; for the dairymen find that they cannot sell their products when made from cattle reeking with disease, no matter how sleek their sides, and the whole system of dairying of the State is being overhauled and improved as a result of the investigations of one of the instructors in one department of the agricultural college and experiment station.

Take another instance.

A well-known professor in one of the Western institutions of this type has been for ten years conducting a series of investigations in the breeding of wheats. He has demonstrated by a careful selection and consummate skill in breeding one type of wheat to another, that immensely increased yields of grain result. He has conducted the experiments on a small scale, naturally, as it requires a long time to get results when the experimenter starts with only two kernels of wheat to produce a race of wheat, but the investigations have shown that it is wholly feasible to produce a type of wheat, absolutely original in nature, which will increase the yield of wheat in this country, and perhaps in the rest of the world in similar latitudes, by an enormous percentage. During the season of 1896 the experiments are being carried out on a more extensive scale than ever, and the result of the field work at one of the sub-stations is quite likely to add some new and powerful varieties of wheat which will replace the already high type of the famous wheat regions of the Northwest.

So one might enumerate instance after instance, not confined to any one section of the country, to show the singularly practical nature of the work done in these agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

At regular intervals the colleges and stations issue bulletins, usually stripped of all scientific verbiage, which are distributed free of charge through the mails to the farmers of the State.

These bulletins contain the condensed results of the experiments in the breeding of cattle, in the improvement of small fruits, in the methods for the destruction of dangerous insects, in food analysis to determine both for man and beast what foods are most helpful, in soil analysis to find out what grains particular kinds of soils will best produce, and in a wide variety of other lines.

Through the kindness of Director True, of the office of Experiment Stations at Washington, I give this condensed statement of the scope of the work now in progress at these stations, all of which work is done in the institutions which conduct agricultural courses for the education of farmers.

Thirty stations are studying problems relating to meteorology and climatic conditions. Forty-three stations are at work upon the soil, investigating its geology, physics, or chemistry, or conducting soil tests with fertilizers or in other ways. Twenty stations are studying questions relating to drainage or irrigation. Thirty-nine stations are making analyses of commercial and home-made fertilizers or are conducting field experiments with fertilizers. Forty-eight stations are studying the more important crops, either with regard to their composition, nutritive value, methods of manuring, and cultivation, and the best varieties adapted to individual localities, or with reference to systems of rotation. Thirty-five stations are investigating the composition of feeding stuffs and, in some instances, making digestion experiments. Twenty-five stations are dealing with questions relating to silos and silage. Thirty-seven stations are conducting feeding experiments for beef, milk, mutton, or pork, or are studying different methods of feeding. Thirty-two stations are investigating subjects relating to dairying, including the chemistry and bacteria of milk, creaming, butter-making, or the construction and management of creameries. Botanical studies occupy more or less of the attention of twenty-seven stations, including investigations in systematic and physiological botany, with a special reference to the diseases of plants, testing of seeds with reference to their vitality and purity, classification of weeds and methods for their eradication. Forty-three stations work to a greater or less extent in horticulture, testing varieties of vegetables and large and small fruits. Several stations have begun operations in forestry. Thirty-one stations investigate injurious insects with a view to their restriction or their destruction. Sixteen study

and treat animal diseases or perform such operations as the dehorning of animals. At least seven stations are engaged in bee culture, and three in experiments with poultry.

The influence of the graduates of these agricultural institutions upon the farmers in the vicinity to which they go after being graduated is very great. Some of the earlier institutions made the mistake of introducing too extensive a course of such studies as were needed for ornament rather than for use, and to this, no doubt, is to be attributed the failure of a good many students of agricultural colleges to return to the farms for their life work. The more advanced institutions of to-day, however, are aiming to make the instruction appropriate for practical uses on the farm rather than to attempt that pleasant and, indeed, commendable, but in this case inappropriate, breadth of culture which is afforded in more classical courses.

In order to ascertain with as much definiteness as possible the percentage of students in agricultural courses who go back to the farms, the writer requested the following information from the presidents of the various agricultural colleges and from the presidents of such colleges and universities as have agricultural courses :

1. The number of students in agriculture.
2. The number graduated since the establishment of the college.
3. The percentage of students in agriculture going back to the farms after graduation.

Some of the institutions are universities having agricultural courses, some have distinct agricultural colleges in the body of the university, some are agricultural colleges alone, and some are industrial and agricultural combined, so that it is difficult to arrive at absolute definiteness. The following table, however, prepared during the month of July, 1896, will give a comprehensive view of the work. It will be noted that the number of students in agriculture going back to the farms varies much. In some States there is little agricultural activity, and there is a tendency in some quarters to a too generous curriculum, leading the young men to enter the professions rather than to become agriculturalists : the model institution will so shape its courses that the student will perforce become an agriculturalist.

No account is made in this table of the large number of

students who do not graduate, but who, after one or two years of work, return to the farms. Neither is there any showing of the very large number of actual farmers who attend the schools for dairymen, running for a month or two each season in many of the agricultural colleges established to give farmers a more scientific knowledge of this particular line of farm work, nor of the many young women, not regular students, who come in from the farms to study a few weeks or perhaps two months in the branches particularly helpful to them—dairying, dressmaking, physiology, care and cooking of foods, farm chemistry, and all the various lines which may be included in the department of domestic economy. A very important work is done in these two last-named departments which does not have any statistical value. There are no graduates in these schools for non-students, and courses of study are not so much followed as are plain, practical talks and lectures from professors and instructors. And yet the influence of even this fragmentary work is of great value.

The table referred to is as follows; where the name of the State alone is given the institution is a part of the university of the State:

Name of institution.	No. of students in agriculture.	Number graduated.	Percentage returning to farms.
Iowa Agricultural College	96	252	50
Alabama Agricultural College	103	167	10
Colorado " "	232	80	80
North Carolina " "	20	56	25
North Dakota " "	11	2	100
Maryland " "	20	—	90
Pennsylvania " "	340	305	—
Massachusetts " "	176	476	62
Texas " "	181	53	14
Mississippi " "	122	183	75
Oklahoma " "	167	6	60
New Hampshire Agri. College	153	157	20
Michigan " "	234	622	34
Utah " "	—	5	50
Rhode Island " "	121	19	90
Vermont " "	79	10	40
Indiana Sch. of Agri., Purdue University	64	175	75
Wisconsin	98	12	50
Cornell University, New York	141	86	100
Alcorn Agri. College, Mississippi	200	80	50
Nebraska	45	—	75
Ohio	84	28	—
West Virginia	6	—	100
Storrs Agri. College, Connecticut	138	120	75
South Dakota Agricultural College	24	46	—
Minnesota " "	233	138	92

The total number of students in agriculture in the various institutions of the United States in the autumn of 1896 will be

in the neighborhood of five thousand. Nearly four thousand have been graduated since these institutions were established. Nearly eleven millions of acres of land have been granted to these institutions by the general government, and over nine million five hundred thousand dollars have been realized from the sale of the land so far put on the market. The value of the buildings and grounds of the various institutions is about sixteen millions of dollars; of libraries, a little over one million of dollars; of scientific apparatus, two million five hundred thousand dollars; while the annual revenue amounts to over four millions of dollars.

The agricultural progress of the closing century has been made under great difficulties, at the cost of untold treasure, at the sacrifice of enormous natural resources, amidst the almost criminal squandering of precious substances. The nation has not been "strangled with her waste fertility," for there has been vast return from the labor expended, so generous the soil; and yet, judged by the progress made since scientific agriculture began to distribute its forces, the coming century will witness a development of new, and a restoration of old, soils resulting in returns undreamed of by the most sanguine followers of the noble calling of agriculture.

W. S. HARWOOD.

SOME LATER ASPECTS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

BY THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE,
BISHOP OF ALBANY.

MOST questions and issues have their season. But the issue and question of woman suffrage, like death, seems to have "all seasons for its own." It sows its tares, like the enemy, while most women sleep; and with a vigor and a vigilance worthy of a better cause, the promoters of it are everywhere and all the time at work. It was to be supposed—and by most of the women opposed to suffrage, it was supposed—that nobody would venture to suggest to the representative party gatherings at the last political conventions, to stop and think about women's votes, when they were stirred to the utmost by the great financial questions about silver and gold; and when each party was laboring to do that which would unite its different factions. But the suffrage women certainly were silverites, in the sense that they preferred speech to golden silence, and insisted on being heard. No one of the anti-suffrage women imagined, either, that that question could be brought into the Presidential election, but Mrs. Victoria Woodhull Martin—name neither *clarum* nor *venerabile* to some of us—announces the discovery, which she made twenty-six years ago, that the written words of the Constitution of the United States giving her the right to vote will this year be operative; that the Colorado women will vote for Presidential electors this fall, and that "the next President may owe his election to a woman." Under these circumstances, I should be glad to call the attention of the readers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, in its columns, to the claims of women who desire not to be burdened with this duty, and to some new light thrown upon it by things that have been said and done within the last few months. I begin with the constitutional interpretation of Mrs. Martin. She

is the editor of a magazine called *The Humanitarian;* and the leading editorial in the issue of the magazine for July, 1896, is devoted to woman's suffrage. It is prefixed by a recent photograph of Mrs. Victoria Woodhull Martin, and interspersed woodcuts of her in various attitudes; first, before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, modestly reading an argument; secondly, boldly accepting a nomination for President of the United States in Apollo Hall, New York, while a multitude of men's hats, flying in the air or held on canes, are waved by manly hands; and, thirdly, with the poetical and classical affix "*Victoria Victa*" standing with her sister, to be denied the exercise of the electoral franchise, in the city of New York, on the 7th day of November, the year not being given. Mrs. Martin considers that the cause of woman suffrage in America is virtually won.

"If it be conceded that the women of the State of Colorado should vote for the President at the Presidential election of 1896, on what grounds of reason or justice shall the women of the other States of the Union be debarred from voting too? To permit the women of Colorado to vote at the Presidential election and to exclude the women of the remaining States will be an illogical and invidious position which cannot be maintained."

There is a little difficulty in the fact that Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming are the only States in which women are permitted to cast their votes, the woman's vote in Kansas being only in municipal elections. And there is a little discouragement, too, in that New York, in its Constitutional Convention, denied suffrage to women by a vote of two to one; that the Legislatures of South Carolina and Rhode Island have just refused it; that in Massachusetts 95 per cent. of the population of the State declined it by a popular vote; and that other States have, to say the least, not granted it yet. But difficulties and discouragements do not disturb Mrs. Martin. "The cause of woman suffrage," she says, "is virtually won." I am glad she is content with the winning, and hope that it may go no further. But there is a discrepancy between Mrs. Martin's satisfaction and her argument. Her satisfaction is that a single State, Colorado, permits its women to vote. Her argument is that the State has no call or concern to deal with the question at all, since it is settled, she says, by the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Of this fact

she was the original discoverer twenty-six years ago. The only result, so far, was her unsuccessful nomination for President, in Apollo Hall, and her unsuccessful attempt to vote at the polls in New York. Still she discovered this, acting, she says, "on her own initiative," whatever that may mean; and she states that "the day in which for the first time a woman's voice—her own—was heard, in the Judiciary Chamber at Washington, was not only the most memorable day of her life, but also a memorable day in the history of the woman's movement in America." "The argument," she says, "was lengthy," and "three weeks later the majority report was presented to the House of Representatives, admitting the basic proposition of her memorial, but"—by some most illogical inconsistency—"recommending that the petition should not be granted." She also adds that "the sensation which followed the printing of her memorial was *immense.*" And yet, in spite of this modest estimate of her discovery and its influence, she was not elected President and not even allowed to vote. Since that time, she says that the women suffragists have drifted away from her position and "gone back to the old discredited methods and worn-out cries." Mrs. Victoria Woodhull Martin admits one or two things with great frankness: that the progress of the cause generally is very far short of what it was confidently hoped it would be twenty-four years ago; that internal dissensions, divisions, and jealousies have been the bane of the suffrage movement from the beginning; that in England the subject has been dropped, "despite the platitudes of vote-catching ministers," "with a silence which is almost contemptuous." We thank her for the honesty of these admissions, which have in them a plain and strong argument against the fitness of women by temperament for political life; and echo her suggestion that those "who would govern others must first learn to govern themselves." But what of the constitutional argument? It strikes us as the weakest of all weak positions that have yet been taken from which to push this preposterous and dangerous claim. There is no faintest or remotest relation between woman suffrage and the 15th Amendment of the Constitution, which reads:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Women are not a race. They certainly are too many colored to be prejudiced by any one hue; and except upon the silly cry of emancipation, they are not, and have not been, "in a previous condition of servitude." So there is no shadow of reference to the case.

The 14th Article of the Constitution reads thus:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

But nobody is talking about abridging privileges or immunities to citizens. Mrs. Victoria Woodhull Martin means, of course, women citizens; but they have never been *granted* the privilege and immunity of voting, consequently the existence of the word "male" before the word "person" in our State constitutions does not *abridge* any woman's privilege, because she never had it. The Constitution does not deny that women are citizens, because women are persons. It does not, therefore, say that they have the privilege of voting; and Mrs. Martin falls between two stools, because she acknowledges that the Colorado women get their authority to vote by action of the State, and not by the Constitution of the United States; and she claims that voting is not a *privilege* but the *right* of women, which cannot, therefore, be counted under the constitutional head of privilege or immunity. I think it will be a long while before woman suffrage gets anything but a minority report in favor of it on this claim.

I find the same claim made by Mr. W. S. Harwood in the May number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. "The Constitution of the United States permits the suffrage of women;" but the positiveness of this assertion is stronger than the argument that sustains it. The article of the Constitution which declares that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States, etc.," deals with *privileges* and *immunities*, and not with the *right* to vote, or with any other right at all. And there certainly is a distinction between rights and privileges and between rights and immunities. The 15th Amendment, which deals with the right of citizens to vote, refers exclusively

to questions of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude," and consequently has no reference whatever to *sex*. Mr. Harwood's application of the definition of a person as "a man, woman, or child" proves too much. He says that adultism (wretched word) is taken for granted. But if *all persons* are citizens in the sense of having from that fact a right to vote, then it follows that children have a right to vote. Mr. Harwood's attempt to get rid of the force of the word "male" in the second section of the 14th Amendment, "when the right to vote is denied to any of the *male* inhabitants of such State," limps badly. He says "there is no suggestion here that women may not be voters"; but there is plainly the suggestion that in the mind of the Constitution only male inhabitants are thought of as voters, else the argument would mean that denying a right to male voters was a crime with a penalty, but that it would not be a crime, and would have no penalty to deny the right to female voters. Over against his supposed case of a test question, "If the Colorado electors should decide the question of the Presidential election"—and may Heaven avert the calamity of such a close vote—over against this must be borne in mind the fact, that if not giving women the right to vote, in the State of New York, for instance, is a violation of the fourteenth article and the fifteenth amendment, because it is either "abridging privileges and immunities," or because it is denying or abridging the right to vote by "reason of race, color, or previous condition of servitude," then the electoral vote of New York might be contested on the ground of unconstitutionality. The fact is that the Constitution of the United States does not settle, does not deal with, this question of woman suffrage at all. The implication in the second section of the 14th Amendment is very strong, that the framers or the amenders of the Constitution take for granted that only males were voters. But the strong point is this, that throughout our history voting has been considered as belonging to men of full age; that it is so specified in many State constitutions (where it could not constitutionally be if the Constitution gave the right to women); that the female suffrage advocates have felt and still feel that their only way to secure the vote is by altering the State constitutions, to cut out the word "male" before "person," or to insert the word "female." And if Colorado women vote for Presidential

electors this year, it will not be because the Constitution of the United States allows it, but because, no definite prohibition of it being in that document, the State of Colorado has decided what many other States disallow or have refused, that its women may vote. Whether that decision under all the traditions of our history and under the plain implications of the Constitution would hold before the court is for lawyers and not laymen to say.

The editorial just quoted from *The Humanitarian* states that woman suffrage is not in the forefront of American politics. It is not the fault of the women suffragists that it is not so this year. When the Republican National Convention met in St. Louis in June, 1896, Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake presented to the Committee on Resolutions a petition, which, after a long preamble, asked to have introduced as a plank in the Republican platform, this resolution:

"*Resolved:* That we favor the submission of the question of woman suffrage to the qualified voters in all States where there is a demand for such submission."

What they succeeded in getting was this:

"The Republican party is mindful of the rights and interests of women. Protection of American industries includes equal opportunities, equal pay for equal work, and protection to the home. We favor the admission of women to wider spheres of usefulness, and welcome their co-operation in rescuing the country from Democratic and Populistic mismanagement and misrule."

With an incoherent inconsistency, which passes even ordinary feminine unreasoning, having secured *this* from the Republicans, they proceeded to the Democratic-Populist Convention in Chicago with a similar demand, but naturally not for similar reasons. Just why that hysterical gathering of revolutionary radicals, who attacked every sacred and stable element of government and society, did not add to their political heresies this disturbing of the divine balance of the sexes, this destroying of the peace and sanctity of home, passes comprehension; but they did not. Possibly they may have had in mind the St. Louis suggestion of their mismanagement and misrule and not been, therefore, attracted much to the women themselves. Mrs. Crannell says that it was "a convention of surprises," and Mrs. Crannell knows; for, under God, it was due to her quiet, clear, strong, dignified presentation of the argument against woman suffrage that the plank proposed by Mrs. Blake was not introduced into the Repub-

lican platform; and that the whole thing was treated, in the Democratic Convention, with "a silence that was almost contemptuous." Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, of Albany, both in St. Louis and Chicago, alone, and in the midst of a company of woman suffragists who were, as she said laughingly, "in the ratio of 16 to 1," did a service which the best of American womanhood is grateful for. And she illustrated, moreover, just what kind of power a true woman, not unsexed, can exercise in the way of political influence, so long as she is excused from entering the ranks of voters or candidates for office. She needs and asks no praise from me. I am glad that her admirable speeches at these two conventions have been printed and distributed by the Anti-Suffrage Association of the Third Judicial District of the State of New York. They deserve the careful study of everyone interested in this subject. Dr. Swenson, of Kansas, one of the Resolutions Committee, at the St. Louis Convention, said to her, after she concluded her speech: "I live in Kansas, where women vote. You voice my sentiments to the letter. I wish all women were of the same mind as you."

A few extracts from her two addresses will give an impression both of the ability and of the direction of her argument.

"Do you think that a solution of the problem that is vexing men's minds and casting shades of gloom over the whole country can be found in adding to the already unwieldy and uncertain quality called male suffrage, the vote of every woman in this land?

"For suffrage is not asked only for the women who are here to-day, but for every woman in our land, without regard to intelligence or morality.

"If there be any among you who believes at all in the extension of suffrage to all women, I ask you, seriously, is this the time for its inception? Have you not to face such problems as have not often vexed men's souls, and do you think it would be wise, at this time, to throw into the boiling mass of unrest and disquiet the uncertain element of woman suffrage?"

Mrs. Crannell's statistics as to the proportion of women suffragists to population is taken from the *Woman's Journal*, which is edited by the husband and daughter of Lucy Stone.

"I appear before you unwillingly; but as the representative of the many millions of women who have hitherto proved the "silent majority." I come from New York State where there are only 1,600 enrolled suffragists out of nearly 7,000,000 people, or 29 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her population. I have also been asked to represent the home-loving women of Massachusetts, where there are but 51 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; of Pennsylvania, where there are only 14 organized suffragists to every 100,000 of her population; of New Hampshire, where there are but 5 suffragists to every 100,000 of her inhabitants; of Connecticut, where there

are only 23 suffragists to every 100,000 of her inhabitants; of South Carolina, where there are but 3 suffragists for every 100,000 of her people; of Arkansas, where there are only 3 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; besides being asked to speak by women of prominence in California, where there are but 33 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Illinois, where there are but 13 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Michigan, where there are only 6 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Kentucky, where there are but 32 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Iowa where there are only 6 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Virginia, where there is but 1 suffragist to every 100,000 of her people; in Maryland, where there are only 6 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Maine, where there are but 12 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; in Ohio, where there are only 11 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people; and in New Jersey, where there are but 8 suffragists to every 100,000 of her people. All these requests coming to me unsolicited."

She replies to what Mrs. Victoria Woodhull Martin calls "the worn-out cries of the suffragists," which are not so worn out as not to be shrill enough to be heard a good way off in various points:

"First: That women who pay taxes should have a ballot. In answer, we assert that the women who pay taxes do not want the ballot. The taxes are not conditioned upon the right to vote. That there is no discrimination against women in taxation. That taxation is the price the citizens pay for the protection of their property, their life, their liberty.

"That while there are in New York State 144,000 women who pay taxes, there are at least 1,500,000 women who do not pay taxes; and the granting of suffrage to these women would more than duplicate the evils from which the taxpayer now suffers.

"Second: That when women have the ballot, they will be employed constantly and at higher wages. The answer is shown in the fact that men vote and are yet unemployed.

"Third: That the cause of temperance will be helped when women vote. Statistics tell us that while the population of the United States has increased not 20 per cent. in the last two decades, the dram-taking and drug-drinking women have increased 500 per cent. *The Christian Advocate* is my authority for the statement that before the high-license law in Philadelphia, Pa., out of 8,034 saloon licenses, 3,696 were granted to women. In Boston, Mass., last spring, out of 1,100 liquor licenses, 491 were applied for by women.

"Fourth: If equal wages for equal work means anything at all, it means that no man shall be paid more for his work than the women are begging to receive. For instance, if that law could be passed and enforced, the merchant could say to his male employee that he could fill his shop with girls at half the price he was paying him, and while he preferred keeping the man at the higher rate, he must either discharge him or lower his wages to that which women were asking to receive.

"Fifth: The facts for the suffragists to prove are that suffrage is necessary for the protection of women, and that it would be beneficial to the state. They have not, and cannot, prove either. To-day, in New York State, and in many of the other States, a woman is protected better by the laws that men

have made than by any she could make herself. A husband cannot sell his real estate unless the wife joins in the deed. He cannot deprive her by will of right of dower. The wife can by deed or will dispose of her entire estate, real or personal, whether the husband consents or not. A father cannot now apprentice his child or make a valid appointment of a testamentary guardian without the consent of the mother, if she be living. The wife can carry on business on her own account, and is entitled to all the profits and earnings in that business, and may contract as if she were unmarried. Every profession is open to women, and every occupation also."

The practical result of woman suffrage, where it has been tried, is, perhaps, the strongest argument against it. Let us notice the result, as Mrs. Crannell gives it in our own country:

"The suffragists speak of what has been accomplished by woman suffrage in a hazy sort of way. Let us have facts.

"Cheyenne, the capital of Wyoming, where women have voted for a quarter of a century, has a population of less than 12,000. I am told that in Cheyenne there are 25 licensed gambling-houses, and that saloons are as numerous as any other kind of stores; and it has been officially stated that not a single act of legislation aimed at the betterment of the human race has been passed in Wyoming through woman's influence. General Thompson, who managed the Democratic campaign in Wyoming, in 1892, said: 'The women's vote is the easiest thing in the world to get, and the easiest thing to keep, and the easiest thing to manipulate of any element in politics.' After six months' residence in Wyoming, divorce may be obtained for 11 reasons!

"The history of woman's influence in the legislative halls of the other States where woman suffrage obtains is not a glowing tribute to their intelligence or probity, and has been in existence too short a time to be given as precedent for the States East and South. The partial suffrage referred to is also a thing not to be boasted of by the women who desire the suffrage. The record of the Massachusetts vote is that, in 1888, 20,252 women registered in the interest of school suffrage, and most of them voted, for it was a warfare of religious sects—a Protestant and a Roman Catholic fight, such as would appeal to most women. The next year the number of women registering was reduced nearly one-half. In 1891, 3,000 women registered and only two-thirds of that number voted. The same thing was tried in Connecticut and only two and one-half per cent. of the women entitled to vote exercised that right. Do you imagine for a moment that they would do better if a full franchise were given them? Who are the women who would go to the polls in stormy weather? I do not need to prove to you gentlemen that the women who would vote 'early and often' are not the women to whom you would trust the ballot in case of need."

I turn to a very remarkable paper in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* called "*La Feminisme*," which, I suppose, would be translated in English "Womanness," "in Australia and New Zealand," a paper written by Monsieur Pierre-Leroy Beaulieu. After speaking of the boldness of the Australian Colonists in

social matters and "their disdain of the traditions, prejudices they call them, of old Europe," he says:

"They have taken up Feminism with the same ardor as Socialism. New Zealand in 1893 and Southern Australia in 1895 gave women political electoral rights. If certain classes, agitated with vehemence cried out loudly for the extension of the electorate to women in the colonies which have adopted it, as they still do in those which have not yet decided the question, the mass of the public, and especially the mass of women, care nothing for this reform. In the upper classes, the indifference of women is complete on this subject. I have talked with a large number of them at Melbourne, in Sydney, and in New Zealand, and, without exception, they have replied to me that they cared nothing for the right to vote. Among the middle classes of people, especially in the little Bourgeoisie, a certain number, without doubt, are more interested in it; but really the only people who hold to this political emancipation are literary women, professors, and teachers; and still more, they tell me, divorced people, whose private life is unhappy and whose character is soured. It is naturally this group that makes itself heard. The great mass remain silent, precisely because it is indifferent. At the bottom, this whole feminist movement is nothing but a great *humbug*, devised by politicians who are always in pursuit of new agitations, by those who have lost their positions, and by hot-headed people; and it commands in Australia two powerful assistants: First, the working party, because the extremes of Democracy always confound the words 'change' and 'reform'; and also because the chiefs of the syndicates think that the women of the working classes, entirely deprived of political education, will vote in the same way as their husbands; while the most of those of the higher classes will abstain from voting. The second strong support of the movement which one finds very powerful in Australia, in England, and in every Anglo-Saxon country is the party of Temperance, or still more of Prohibition, which dreams of the entire suppression of the sale of alcoholic drinks, to which idea the mass of women is absolutely given over. If the women of the middle and lower classes are less uninterested than those of the upper classes in obtaining the right to vote, if a large number of them choose to use that which has been given to them, it is because they feel keenly about the frightful influence of alcohol upon their fathers, their husbands, and their brothers; and because they and their children are the first to suffer. In effect, if women do not eagerly desire to be admitted to the electorate in Australia—and that is a fact incontestable by anyone who observes it in good faith; they did, nevertheless, use the rights which had been given to them, once, with great ardor, when, in the elections of 1893 in New Zealand, the first and only elections in this Colony under the new *régime*, 78 per cent. were enrolled and 64 per cent. voted. The proportion of men was still stronger, namely 72. The question of the sale of alcoholic liquors played an important part in this electoral campaign, and the Parliament elected at this time passed new laws severely regulating the sale of liquors. Important as it may be to put a rein upon the plague of alcoholism, it is, nevertheless, a serious matter to bring about a social and political reform so deep as the admission of women to the electorate, not because of what it is worth in itself, but for accessory reasons.

"There is here an example of the greatest evil of modern society—the

subordination of all things to the electoral interest, the vote upon measures most important, without considering their intrinsic qualities and their future consequences, only because of the immediate results which can be expected from it. The very eagerness of the women in favor of the prohibition of alcohol, which has gained for them the sympathy of the Temperance party, does it not prove the tendencies of their nature which make least desirable their participation in the government? Is it not a witness of that tendency to decide, not according to reason, but according to sentiment—to go into extremes—to admit no middle ground? Is it not, above all, the proof of the favor with which they look upon 'grandmotherly' legislation, which would protect men against all danger and temptation, shut them up in a network of minuter prescriptions recalling the care, the watchfulness of every moment, with which the earlier years of their life were surrounded. There are curious contradictions among the promoters of this Feministic movement. There are the advanced people who have incessantly in their mouths the great name of Darwin and the theory of evolution. Why do they pretend to make in one day, then, woman the equal of man, although her subordinate position during series of ages (if it is not her original nature) has made her a very different creature. It is strange, too, that the same parties who preach the similarity of the two sexes should insist, beside the electorate, upon the eligibility of women and their admission to all the professions, and protest, on the other hand, against their employment in manufactories, not only because the work is injurious to their health, but because it prevents them from having leisure for the cares of the home, and because it destroys the family hearth."

M. Leroy Beaulieu's statement of a fact, often misstated, is very admirable: "Grant that woman is not inferior to man, but she is different. That is to say, inferior on certain sides, and superior on others. Let us leave her then to exercise her activities in the sphere in which that superiority has been demonstrated!"

It is quite possible that the fact asserted here, that the influence of women's votes would be exercised in favor of prohibition, may be claimed as an argument in favor of woman's suffrage. But that this does not necessarily follow is shown by the Wyoming experiences alluded to above. And more than that, leaving out of consideration the desirableness of prohibition—the philosophy of the question turns upon M. Beaulieu's reasoning that it demonstrates the danger of political questions being decided by sentiment and feeling, if the ballot were given to that part of humanity which is by temperament sentimental and emotional. If there came, however, as there may come, the introduction of religious excitement into a political question, there would be an aggravation of the danger most serious and alarming.

The arguments *pro* and *con* have been stated and repeated over

and over. Little, if anything, new can be said on either side, only as the movement takes to itself some new phases or new phrases that need to be met. But against the argument of expectation, the constant claim that if or when women are allowed to vote the political atmosphere will be clearer, the corruption in politics will be done away with, and the best social and moral interests advanced—in answer to this argument of expectation stands the argument of experience, the statement of results where woman suffrage has been tried, the fact that it has not appealed to the women of the soundest, the safest, the most substantial character and position; and the argument of experience is strong, uniform, and pronounced against giving women the privilege of voting. If the movement does not die out of itself, if it is not broken up by the avowed "dissensions, divisions, and jealousies" within it, it is sure to be scotched and killed by its own outcome and results.

W. Croswell Doane.

WHAT IS THE JUSTIFICATION OF MARTIAL LAW?

BY G. NORMAN LIEBER, U. S. JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL.

MILITARY jurisdiction is of four kinds, viz.:

1. Military law, which is the legal system that regulates the government of the military establishment. Military law is a branch of the municipal law, and in the United States derives its existence from special constitutional grants of power.

2. The law of hostile occupation, or military government, as it is sometimes called; that is, military power exercised by a belligerent over the inhabitants and property of an enemy's territory, occupied by him. This belongs to the law of war, and, therefore, to the law of nations.

3. Martial law applied to the army; that is, military power extended in time of war, insurrection, or rebellion over persons in the military service, as to obligations arising out of such emergency, and not falling within the domain of military law, nor otherwise regulated by law. It is an application of the doctrine of necessity, founded on the right of national self-preservation.

4. Martial law at home, or as a domestic fact; by which is meant military power exercised in time of war, insurrection, or rebellion in parts of the country retaining allegiance, and over persons and things not ordinarily subject to it.

It is to this last-mentioned kind of military jurisdiction that these remarks apply. Whether, under our political system, such a jurisdiction can exist, and, if so, what it is and by whose authority, or under what circumstances it can exist, and what would be its justification? as to these questions theories widely differ. For, even by those who admit that it may exist, it is claimed, on the one hand, that it is a constitutional power vested in Congress, and, in cases of emergency not admitting of delay, in the President; and, on the other hand, that it is purely the

doctrine of necessity as applied to the right of national self-preservation; neither expressed nor included in any written law, but depending for its justification upon a question of fact—the fact of necessity.

The conflicting views on this subject were clearly stated in the celebrated case of *ex parte* Milligan (4th Wallace, United States Supreme Court Reports, p. 2), in which five of the justices sustained the theory of necessity, and the Chief Justice and three others contended for what, for the sake of convenience, I will call the constitutional theory. The majority of the court held as follows:

"It follows, from what has been said on this subject, that there are occasions when martial rule can be properly applied. If, in foreign invasion or civil war, the courts are actually closed, and it is impossible to administer criminal justice according to law, then, on the theatre of active military operations, where war really prevails, there is a necessity to furnish a substitute for the civil authority, thus overthrown, to preserve the safety of the army and society; and as no power is left but the military, it is allowed to govern by martial rule until the laws can have their free course. As necessity creates the rule, so it limits its duration; for, if this government is continued after the courts are reinstated, it is a gross usurpation of power. Martial rule can never exist where the courts are open, and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their jurisdiction. It is also confined to the locality of actual war. Because, during the late rebellion it could have been enforced in Virginia, where the national authority was overturned and the courts driven out, it does not follow that it should obtain in Indiana, where that authority was never disputed, and justice was always administered. And so in the case of a foreign invasion, martial law may become a necessity in one State, when, in another, it would be 'mere lawless violence.'"

On the other hand, the minority, consisting of Chief Justice Chase and Justices Wayne, Swayne, and Miller, said:

"There is no law for the government of the citizens, the armies, or the navy of the United States, within American jurisdiction, which is not contained in or derived from the Constitution." And, further, what may be denominated martial law proper (*i. e.*, martial law at home), "is called into action by Congress, or temporarily, when the action of Congress cannot be invited, and in the case of justifying or excusing peril, by the President, in times of insurrection or invasion, or of civil or foreign war, within districts or localities where ordinary law no longer adequately secures public safety and private rights."

I cannot but think that the opinion of the majority presents the true doctrine—that of necessity. There is a difference of views as to whether the fact that the courts are closed is the conclusive test of the existence of the necessity justifying a resort to martial law, or rather that the fact that the courts are open is

conclusive proof that the necessity does not exist, but this is not the main question at issue. That question is: What is the justification, law or necessity? And this question is of vital importance, for in the answer to it we must look for the safeguard against the arbitrary exercise of military power. But it is evident at first sight that there can be no such safeguard if there is not an ultimate responsibility on the part of him who has committed the arbitrary act, whether in person or by deputy. That is to say, when the war is over, there must be an ultimate responsibility before the courts. There can be no other safeguard than that. Take that away and the people are without any protection against the invasion of their civil rights by the military power.

In the arraignment of the King of England in the Declaration of Independence it was said: "He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power;" and, carrying out the principles of that arraignment, the makers of our Constitution agreed upon a bill of rights which was at all times and under all circumstances to prevent encroachment by the federal government on the citizen's inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In that bill of rights we find the following:

"ARTICLE IV.—The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

"ARTICLE V.—No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

"ARTICLE VI.—In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."

Chief Justice Chase, in the minority opinion in *ex parte* Milligan, said: "We agree in the proposition that no department

of the government of the United States—neither President, nor Congress, nor the courts—possesses any power not given by the Constitution."

But he further says:

"Congress has the power not only to raise and support and govern armies, but to declare war. It has, therefore, the power to provide by law for carrying on war. This power necessarily extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of war with vigor and success, except such as interferes with the command of the forces and the conduct of campaigns. That power and duty belong to the President as commander-in-chief. Both these powers are derived from the Constitution, but neither is defined by that instrument. Their extent must be determined by their nature and by the principles of our institutions.

"The power to make the necessary laws is in Congress; the power to execute in the President. Both powers imply many subordinate and auxiliary powers. Each includes all authorities essential to its due exercise. But neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President. Both are servants of the people, whose will is expressed in the fundamental law. Congress cannot direct the conduct of campaigns, nor can the President, or any commander under him, without the sanction of Congress, institute tribunals for the trial and punishment of offences, either of soldiers or civilians, unless in cases of a controlling necessity, which justifies what it compels, or at least insures acts of indemnity from the justice of the legislature.

"We by no means assert that Congress can establish and apply the laws of war where no war has been declared or exists.

"Where peace exists, the laws of peace must prevail. What we do maintain is, that when the nation is involved in war, and some portions of the country are invaded, and all are exposed to invasion, it is within the power of Congress to determine in what States or districts such great and imminent public danger exists as justifies the authorization of military tribunals for the trial of crimes and offences against the discipline or security of the army or against the public safety."

I confess that I cannot understand how this can be true when we have all these safeguards of the Constitution, which we know are not suspended by war; for as the Supreme Court has said, "the Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances."* It is true that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* may be suspended during insurrection or invasion, but, as Judge Cooley says: "The suspension does not legalize what is done while it continues; it merely suspends for the time this particular remedy. All other remedies for illegal arrests remain

* Not, of course, those against whom war is being waged.—Miller *v.* U. S., 11 Wallace, 268.

and may be pursued against the parties making or continuing them."

Had the framers of the Constitution suspected that there lurked somewhere in it so dangerous a doctrine as that the safeguards of the bill of rights could be set aside by legislation, the Constitution in its present form would never have become the organic law of the United States.

For the danger is this. If that military power over civil rights, which we call martial law, can be called into existence by Congress by virtue of its constitutional powers, the military person, who acts within the limits of such legislation, would be protected by it; for Congress in enacting such a law would be acting under a constitutional political power; the act would be a political act; Congress would be the judge of its necessity; and the necessity could not be inquired into by the courts. Congress can not be controlled by the courts in the exercise of its political discretion. If it has the constitutional power to legislate on the subject at all, it must have the power of deciding on the occasion for the legislation. Is this not true of all the legislative powers? Is the power to regulate commerce, the power to declare war, the power to suspend the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* during rebellion or invasion, subject to a judicial examination of the necessity or occasion for the legislation? Can its expediency be inquired into by the courts? Certainly not. The exercise of such a power is a political measure with which the courts can not interfere.

"Redress may be given in court for an excess or usurpation of power, but there is no remedy for its abuse save through an impeachment, or at the polls. Nor can a court declare a statute unconstitutional and void when the objection to it is merely that it is unjust and oppressive, and violates rights and privileges of the citizen, unless it can be shown that such injustice is prohibited or such rights and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution. The propriety or justice or policy of legislation, within the limits of the Constitution, is exclusively for the legislative department to determine; and the moment a court ventures to substitute its own judgment for that of the Legislature, it passes beyond its legitimate authority and enters a field where it would be impossible to set limits to its interference, except as should be prescribed in its own discretion. The protection against unwise or oppressive legislation, within constitutional bounds, is by an appeal to the justice and patriotism of the representatives of the people. If this fail, the people in their sovereign capacity can correct the evil, but courts cannot assume their rights. The judiciary can only arrest the execution of a statute when it conflicts with the Constitution. It cannot run a race

of opinions upon points of right, reason, and expediency with the lawmaking power. The question of the validity of a statute must always be one of legislative competency to enact it; not one of policy, propriety, or strict justice."*

And so, if Congress has the constitutional power to declare martial law in time of war, the courts cannot enter the field of its legislative discretion in the exercise of this power. Congress may abuse its power and put forth martial law, though there be no actual necessity for it, but the courts will not be able to give any redress for the abuse. If the Constitution confers this power on Congress, its decision as to the expediency of having recourse to it must be conclusive on the courts.

What, then, becomes of the theory of ultimate responsibility—that is to say, of the ultimate liability—in the courts of the military person exercising this kind of military power? The legislative act would be a justification which could not be impeached, and the person injured would be without remedy.†

In Mitchell *v.* Harmony (13 Howard, U. S. Supreme Court Reports, 427) the doctrine of necessity considered as the basis of a military war power—applied in this case to the taking of private property—was thus stated by Chief Justice Taney:

"There are, without doubt, occasions in which private property may lawfully be taken possession of or destroyed to prevent it from falling into the hands of the public enemy; and also where a military officer, charged with a particular duty, may impress private property into the public service or take it for public use. Unquestionably, in such cases, the government is bound to make full compensation to the owner; but the officer is not a trespasser.

"But we are clearly of opinion that in all of these cases the danger must be immediate and impending; or the necessity urgent for the public service, such as will not admit of delay, and where the action of the civil authority would be too late in providing the means which the occasion calls for. It is impossible to define the particular circumstances of danger or necessity in which this power may be lawfully exercised. Every case must depend on its own circumstances. It is the emergency that gives the right, and the emergency must be shown to exist before the taking can be justified.

"In deciding upon this necessity, however, the state of the facts, as they appeared to the officer at the time he acted, must govern the decision; for he must necessarily act upon the information of others as well as his own observation. And if, with such information as he had a right to rely upon, there is reasonable ground for believing that the peril is immediate and menacing, or the necessity urgent, he is justified in acting upon it; and

* Cooley's *Constitutional Law*, page 148.

† See, in addition to *ex parte* Milligan, Griffin *v.* Wilcox, 21 Indiana, 370; Johnson *v.* Jones, 44 Illinois, 142; Hare's *American Constitutional Law*, Volume II., page 968, and Pomeroy's *Constitutional Law*, Sec. 709, *et seq.*

the discovery afterwards that it was false or erroneous will not make him a trespasser. But it is not sufficient to show that he exercised an honest judgment, and took the property to promote the public service; he must show by proof the nature and character of the emergency, such as he had reasonable grounds to believe it to be, and it is then for a jury to say whether it was so pressing as not to admit of delay; and the occasion such, according to the information upon which he acted, that private rights must for the time give way to the common and public good."

We, therefore, have the two cases of *ex parte* Milligan and Mitchell *v.* Harmony, in which the Supreme Court of the United States rested the justification for the setting aside of the established safeguard of personal rights on necessity alone.

Professor Hare finds in Mitchell *v.* Clark (110, U. S., 630), a dangerous recognition by the Supreme Court of the martial-law power of Congress, but I think that the decision in that case will bear and should receive a different construction. The important question in the case was the constitutionality of the Acts of Congress of March 3, 1863, and May 11, 1866, whose object was the protection of military persons against suits for certain acts done by them during the war without authority of law.

The fourth section of the act of March 3, 1863, is as follows:

"Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That any order of the President, or under his authority, made at any time during the existence of the present rebellion, shall be a defence in all courts to any action or prosecution, civil or criminal, pending, or to be commenced, for any search, seizure, arrest, or imprisonment, made, done, or committed, or acts omitted to be done, under and by virtue of such order, or under color of any law of Congress and such defence may be made by special plea, or under the general issue."

And the act of May 11, 1866, gave this provision a more extended application.

With regard to the act of 1863, Professor Hare says:

"This statute assumed that Congress may provide that an order from the President, or under his authority, shall be a justification for any search, seizure, arrest, or imprisonment done or committed by virtue of such order, or under color of any law of Congress, irrespective of the circumstances, and whether these did or did not require the exercise of arbitrary power. It operated as a declaration of martial law throughout the length and breadth of the United States, by authorizing any commanding officer, of whatever grade, to arrest and imprison the citizen or despoil his goods, irrespective of the circumstances, or the necessity which alone can justify an arbitrary deprivation of the natural rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. It was therefore directly in the teeth of the principles laid down in *ex parte* Milligan, and may hereafter serve as a foundation on which to erect a government by the sword."

Of the decision in Mitchell *v.* Clark upholding the constitutionality of these acts he says that "contrasting this decision with the language held in Mitchell *v.* Harmony we seem to be in another land and under a different system of jurisprudence, and no one who was not assured of the fact would believe that both judgments were delivered by the same tribunal."

And yet it is quite certain that Mr. Justice Miller who delivered the opinion in Mitchell *v.* Clark could not have attached that meaning to his words, for in his "Lectures on the Constitution" he says:

"A state of war does not change the relation of a citizen to his government, or displace the civil authorities outside the theatre of conflict" (citing *ex parte* Milligan); "what it may do there depends upon the circumstances and exigencies of the case" (citing Mitchell *v.* Harmony).

The acts of 1863 and 1866 related to three matters, viz: the removal of certain cases from State to United States courts; the protection contained in Section 4 of the Act of 1863, above given; and a limitation to two years for suits growing out of illegal acts committed during the war. Mitchell *v.* Clark was decided upon the question of the constitutionality of the limitation provisions; recognizing the right of Congress to fix a limit to the jurisdiction of the United States courts and thus to the jurisdiction of State courts in cases which can be removed from them to United States courts. In regard to the fourth section of the Act of 1863 the court made use of this language:

"It is not at all difficult to discover the purpose of all this legislation.

"Throughout a large part of the theatre of the civil war the officers of the army, as well as many civil officers, were engaged in the discharge of very delicate duties among a class of people who while asserting themselves to be citizens of the United States were intensely hostile to the government, and were ready and anxious at all times, though professing to be non-combatants, to render every aid in their power to those engaged in active efforts to overthrow the government and destroy the Union.

"For this state of things Congress had provided no adequate legislation, no law by which the powers of these officers were so enlarged as to enable them to deal with this class of persons dwelling in the midst of those who were loyal to the government.

"Some statutes were passed after delay of a general character, but it was seen that many acts had probably been done by these officers in defence of the life of the nation for which no authority of law could be found, though the purpose was good and the act a necessity.

"For most of these acts there was constitutional power in Congress to have authorized them if it had acted in the matter in advance. It is pos-

sible that in a few cases, for acts performed in haste, and in the presence of an overpowering emergency, there was no constitutional power anywhere to make them good.

"But who was to determine this question? and for service so rendered to the government by its own officers and by men acting under the compulsory power of these officers could Congress grant no relief?

"That an act passed after the event, which in effect ratifies what has been done, and declares that no suit shall be sustained against the party acting under color of authority, is valid, so far as Congress could have conferred such authority before, admits of no reasonable doubt. These are ordinary acts of indemnity passed by all governments when the occasion requires it.

"In the legislation to which we have referred in the act of 1863, and the amendatory act of 1866, Congress seems to have well considered this subject, By the fourth section of the act of 1863 it undoubtedly intended to afford an absolute defence, as far as it has power to do so, in this class of cases."

Now, there is absolutely nothing in this language to indicate that in the opinion of the Supreme Court Congress could do more than by a retrospective law legalize what it might have legalized in the first instance. On the contrary it contains the express admission that there are things which it can not legalize. It attempts to draw no line, to lay down no rule pointing out what kinds of things Congress may and what it may not thus legalize. It simply says that which Congress may under its recognized constitutional power authorize to be done it may when its authority is not given in advance cover with an act of indemnity. There does not seem to me to be anything in this decision justifying the conclusion that the Supreme Court intended to fly in the face of its decision in *ex parte* Milligan and to lay down a different theory of martial law from that of necessity as there explained, or indeed to lay down any theory of martial law at all.

It has been claimed that the Reconstruction Acts are also instances of the exercise by Congress of its martial-law power; but they were not so regarded by the Supreme Court. That court, having under consideration the relation of the United States to States in and after rebellion, said:

"These new relations imposed new duties upon the United States. The first was that of suppressing the rebellion. The next was that of re-establishing the broken relations of the State with the Union. The first of these duties having been performed, the next necessarily engaged the attention of the National Government.

"The authority for the performance of the first has been found in the power to suppress insurrection and carry on war; for the performance of the second, authority was derived from the obligation of the United States to guarantee to every State in the Union a re-

publican form of government. The latter, indeed, in the case of a rebellion which involves the government of a State, and for the time excludes the national authority from its limits, seems to be a necessary complement to the former." (Texas *v.* White, 7 Wallace, 727.)

According to the Supreme Court, therefore, the governments under the Reconstruction Acts were not the result of an exercise of the war power of Congress, but of the power to guarantee a republican form of government, which is an entirely distinct and independent power.

Dr. Francis Lieber, in a manuscript note to the "Instructions for the government of the armies of the United States in the field," which was found among his papers after his death, wrote as follows :

"As to martial law at home, which may become necessary in cases of foreign invasion, as well as in cases of domestic troubles, it has full sway in the immediate neighborhood of actual hostilities. The military power may demolish or seize property, or may arrest persons, if indispensable for the support of the army, or the attaining of the military objects in view. This arises out of the immediate and direct physical necessity, as much so as the law of trespass is inoperative against those who forcibly enter a house in a case of conflagration. This operation of martial law is not exclusive or exceptional. Any immediate physical danger, and paramount necessity arising from it, dispenses with the forms of law most salutary in a state of peace.

"The subject of the greatest difficulty connected with martial law is its existence in a country distant from the scene of military action, or in districts which are not in a state of insurrection. How far may it extend in point of geographical limits ? How far may it extend in intrinsic action ? Can it be dispensed with under all circumstances ? How can people devoted to liberty limit its action so that it may not become a means of military despotism ?

"It cannot be dispensed with under all circumstances, and if there were a law prohibiting it, it would break through the law in cases of direct and absolute necessity. The salvation of a country is like the saving of an individual life—it is paramount to all else. . . .

"It has been denied that the government has any right to proclaim martial law, or to act according to its principles, in districts distant from the field of action, or to declare it in larger districts than either cities or counties. This is fallacious. The only justification of martial law is the danger to which the country is exposed, and as far as the positive danger extends, so far extends its justification."

Does not this give all the emergency power that is needed for the protection of the state ?

It is, indeed, given as a reason why the military officer should not be held to a strict accountability under the doctrine that necessity alone will justify his act, that he will often find himself in

the embarrassing and even dangerous dilemma of having to choose between imperilling the public interests with which he is entrusted and the risk of being held personally to account. But, as we have seen in Mitchell *v.* Harmony, the rule of necessity for an act done on the theatre of war is not that the necessity must be absolute, but that it will be measured by its surrounding circumstances, as they appear at the time when the act is done; and away from the theatre of war, which is the greater evil—that the military officer who is at least free to exercise his judgment should be responsible, or that the innocent citizen and community, who have no choice, but must submit to the military power, should suffer?

Chief Justice Chase, in the minority opinion in *ex parte* Milligan, adopted both theories of justification—martial law as a legislative act and martial law as founded in necessity. He expressed it in this language: "It is called into action by Congress, or temporarily, when the action of Congress cannot be invited, and in the case of justifying or excusing peril, by the President, in times of insurrection or invasion or of civil or foreign war, within districts or localities where ordinary law no longer adequately secures public safety and private rights."

To the theory of the martial-law power of Congress others, however, add the further principle that the citizen whom the enforcement of an act of Congress authorizing martial law has injured in person or property has his remedy in the courts; so that their theory on this point, taken all together, is that Congress has the power under the Constitution to declare martial law when necessary in time of war, and the courts may determine the constitutionality of such an act according to their judgment of its necessity. For the reasons already given I do not think the courts could possibly have this power. If they did, all legislation of Congress would be subject to the supervision of the courts as to the necessity or occasion for it.

It has also been asserted that the principle that the constitutional power to declare war includes the power to use the customary and necessary means effectively to carry it on lies at the foundation of martial law. I cannot agree to the proposition. It is positively repudiated by those who justify martial law on the ground of necessity alone, and the Supreme Court of the United States stands committed to no such theory. It is con-

tended that martial law may be authorized by Congress or resorted to by the President or his officers without such authorization, and that in either case its justification is necessity, and that though it be authorized by Congress the officer who enforces it is liable to have his acts judicially investigated and measured by the rule of necessity. But there is no foothold for such a theory. If Congress can declare or authorize a resort to martial law; in other words, if it can set aside the safeguards of the Constitution and substitute military power, or authorize it to be done, its doing so places the military act which it authorizes entirely beyond the reach of the courts, and there is no protection for him who is threatened with it, nor redress for him who suffers by it. It cannot be that the law of the land is so impotent.

Thus far we have been considering the powers of the national government and not of the States. When we come to consider the latter we find ourselves face to face with a political fact quite inapplicable to the former. Congress has no powers save those granted to it by the Constitution, whereas the Legislature of a State has a general power to legislate on all matters which can be made the subject of legislation, subject to the restrictions of the constitutions of the United States and of the State.

"In creating a legislative department and conferring upon it the legislative power, the people must be understood to have conferred the full and complete power as it rests in, and may be exercised by, the sovereign power of any country, subject only to such restrictions as they may have seen fit to impose, and to the limitations which are contained in the Constitution of the United States. The legislative department is not made a special agency for the exercise of specifically defined legislative powers, but is intrusted with the general authority to make laws at discretion."*

Therefore, in order to ascertain whether Congress has a certain power we look to see whether it is delegated to it by the Constitution; but when the question is whether the legislature of a State possesses it we look to see whether it is withheld from it by the Constitution of the United States or of the State. It follows that the existence of a power in Congress cannot be inferred from the existence of a similar power in the State legislature. I call attention to this because it has been attempted.

In the case of Luther *v.* Borden (7 Howard, 1) the right of a

* Cooley's *Constitutional Limitations*, page 104.

State to use its military power in suppressing forcible resistance to its authority was considered. On the occasion which gave rise to this suit the Charter Legislature of Rhode Island passed an act declaring the State under "martial law" and calling out the militia, for the purpose of overcoming those engaged in an attempt to overthrow the established government; and in carrying out this purpose one of its officers, in obedience to the orders of his superior, broke into the house of a person engaged in this unlawful attempt for the purpose of arresting him.

The Supreme Court said:

"In relation to the act of the Legislature declaring martial law, it is not necessary in the case before us to inquire to what extent, nor under what circumstances, that power may be exercised by a State. Unquestionably a military government, established as the permanent government of the State, would not be a republican government, and it would be the duty of Congress to overthrow it. But the law of Rhode Island evidently contemplated no such government. It was intended merely for the crisis, and to meet the peril in which the existing government was placed by the armed resistance to its authority. It was so understood and construed by the State authorities. And, unquestionably, a State may use its military power to put down an armed insurrection too strong to be controlled by the civil authority. The power is essential to the preservation of order and free institutions, and is as necessary to the States of this Union as to any other government. The State itself must determine what degree of force the crisis demands. And if the government of Rhode Island deemed the armed opposition so formidable, and so ramified throughout the State as to require the use of its military force and the declaration of martial law, we see no ground upon which this court can question its authority. It was a state of war, and the established government resorted to the rights and usages of war to maintain itself, and to overcome the unlawful opposition."

In regard to this case it is deserving of particular notice that it is an error to rely on it in proof of the theory that Congress has the power to declare martial law, in the sense in which we have been using that term. It is true that this was a case of so-called "martial law" declared by the legislature, but what did the legislature mean by it? The term has no fixed meaning even at the present day; different writers still give it different meanings. When the legislature of Rhode Island made use of it in 1842 it probably was intended to have no more definite meaning than that the militia of the State was to use its military power to suppress the enemies of the State. It was an authorization to do what was done when the military officer broke into the house of one of the enemies of the State in order to arrest him. He was a public enemy against whom the military power had been

called out. It is evident that this is not the kind of martial law which we have been discussing.

And although the legislature did call it forth, the case of Luther *v.* Borden did not in any way depend upon which department of the government possessed the power; and accordingly the Supreme Court did not consider this question, but only the more general one whether the State possessed it. If the legislature in declaring martial law meant only to authorize the use of the military power of the State to put down its enemies, it exercised a legitimate legislative power, and this was probably all that it did mean, because the facts of the case of Luther *v.* Borden correspond with this view. In whichever way we look at it, that case is no authority for holding that in Congress is vested that martial-law power which we have been considering.

If the question were at the present time to arise whether the legislature of a State has the power to declare martial law, we would, in the first place, consult the Constitution of the United States, and there we would find this prohibition:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The Constitution of the United States affords protection, therefore, against the danger of a declaration of martial law by the legislature of a State as well as against the danger of its declaration by Congress. The principle holds true both as to the United States and the States that the only justification of martial law is necessity.

It is a well-settled principle that when a person is vested by law with a discretionary power his decision within the range of his discretion is conclusive on all, and therefore binding on the courts. This rule has been applied to the subject of martial law, and it has been contended that the officers who enforce it are acting within the range of their discretion, and are protected by the principle which makes them the judges of the necessity of the acts done in the exercise of a martial-law power. From my standpoint such an application of the principle is entirely wrong —for the reason that if martial law is nothing more than the doctrine of necessity called out by the State's right of self-defence the officer can have no discretion in the matter. He will or he

will not be able to justify according to his ability to prove the necessity for his act; he will find no toleration of the plea that the necessity for his act, and therefore its justification, cannot be inquired into by the courts because he was acting within the sphere of his lawful discretion. The officer is not by any law vested with a discretion in this matter. Such a discretion and the doctrine of necessity can not exist together.

But this necessity need not be absolute, as determined by events subsequent to the exercise of the power. The Supreme Court has, as we have already seen, laid down the rule much more favorably to the person using the power. It is worth repeating:

"In deciding upon this necessity, however, the state of the facts, as they appeared to the officer at the time he acted must govern the decision for he must necessarily act upon the information of others as well as his own observations. And if, with such information as he had a right to rely upon, there is reasonable ground for believing that the peril is immediate and menacing, or the necessity urgent, he is justified in acting upon it, and the discovery afterwards that it was false or erroneous will not make him a trespasser. But it is not sufficient to show that he exercised an honest judgment, and took the property to promote the public service; he must show by proof the nature and character of the emergency, such as he had reasonable grounds to believe it to be, and it is then for a jury to say whether it was so pressing as not to admit of delay; and the occasion such, according to the information upon which he acted, that private rights must for the time give way to the common and public good."

Under the Constitution of the United States there can never be any justification for the exercise of the military power to which these remarks relate other than the rule of necessity as thus applied.

G. NORMAN LIEBER.

PROTECTION OF BANK DEPOSITORS.

BY THE HON. JAMES H. ECKELS, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

THE national banking system originated in the financial needs of the government during the war period. However much Secretary Chase may have desired to have a uniform bank currency for the country, it is improbable that that object alone would have been sufficiently strong to secure the passage of the act of 1863. A desirable market for the sale of bonds, with the proceeds of which the war might be prosecuted, became a necessity before the close of the Rebellion; and, in the hope of attaining such a market, inducements, in the shape of profit on a bank-note circulation based upon government bonds, were offered to the public. A review of the history of the system shows that the Secretary's expectations in this direction failed of fulfillment. The feeling of the public was still friendly to the State bank system and to State bank circulation. That feeling had manifested itself in the discussion of the bank act at the time of its passage, and was sufficiently strong to have assured the defeat of the act if it had been then understood that the State bank note was soon thereafter to be completely eliminated from our circulating medium. It was only after the enactment of the statute placing a tax of 10 per cent. upon the note issues of State banks that the national system assumed important proportions, that a bank market for government bonds was established, and the country's bank-note circulation enlarged to any appreciable extent.

During the years of low prices of government bonds and high rates of interest the source of income to the banks was largely the profit arising from the issue of circulating notes. The deposit feature hardly received the attention it deserved, nor was it then the subject of a close and not infrequently dangerous com-

petition upon the part of rival banks. The fact that the federal government had, through the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, supervision of the banks in the new system, the uniformity of method in their conduct, the required frequent publication of statements of their condition, the Comptroller's right of examination into their affairs, his power to enforce assessment against shareholders to make good any impairment of capital stock, and in case of failure to collect a double liability therefrom, all coupled with the providing of certain penalties for the commission of criminal acts by bank officers and directors, could not fail to give them a commanding position in financial affairs in the community where they were located. Under these favoring conditions they attracted to themselves extraordinarily large bank deposits. And thus it has come about that deposit banking is now the feature, and the issuing of circulating notes but the incident, in national banking, instead of, as in the early history of the system, the note-issuing function being the feature and deposit banking but the incident.

Whatever doubt the public may have at first entertained as to the value of a national bank note has long since passed away. Its interest in that question has given way to solicitude for the safety of the depositor. This changed condition has brought with it the need of stricter supervision over the banks upon the part of the government, and of enforcing more rigidly both the direct and implied powers which the bank act has given its officer to protect the people against loss through improper, imprudent, or criminal banking. The legal theory upon which the government takes to itself the right to supervise and control national banks is that they are fiscal agents of the government, and that the government is responsible for the redemption of their circulating notes. Beyond this legal theory, moreover, is the moral obligation growing out of the position which the government gives these institutions in the confidence of the public by assuming any right over them whatsoever. The average depositor has come to look upon the federal government as morally bound to insure to him in the largest measure the safety of his deposit in a national bank, just as the holder of a national bank note knows it to be legally bound to protect him against loss from the same. It is this fact which makes the position of all who have to do with national banking largely that of co-operative trustees with

the general government for the protection of the funds intrusted to the keeping of these banks. In the same attitude are those connected with State banks under State supervisory law.

It is impossible that in the work of maintaining the solvency of any bank the supervising governmental officer should be able to accomplish more than a part. In the largest degree the duty of caring for its interests must fall, as it rightly should, upon the executive officers and directors of a bank. The directors select the executive officers, and they in turn are elected by the shareholders. The individual shareholders are therefore chargeable with a duty toward the depositor which is too often lost sight of, both by the public and themselves. When a bank failure or a bank defalcation occurs the public is apt to forget the duties of any official connected with it except the governmental supervisory officer, and is apt to charge him, because of this mere supervision, with a full responsibility, when the blame should fall wholly upon those whose oaths require of them to have such a knowledge of its affairs as would, if acted upon, have prevented such failure or defalcation. The Comptroller of the Currency and the State Bank Superintendent can do nothing more than undertake to obtain the best knowledge of a bank's condition possible, through examinations made and reported to them by agents of their appointment as frequently as the necessity of each case may seem to demand. Under the most favorable circumstances these examinations must be infrequent and limited in the time occupied in the making of them. The officers of the government, National or State, are not in a position to control each and every affair of the bank, nor to regulate the individual conduct of the bank's officers. They cannot pass judgment upon every loan as it is made, nor enforce the adoption of this or that particular method of bank bookkeeping. Their opportunities are confined to informing themselves upon certain matters essential to the proper discharge of the duties attaching to their office, to seeing that certain legal requirements are complied with, and to making suggestions as to the conduct of a bank, the carrying out of which rests entirely in the discretion and honesty of its officers. This supervisory control in no wise is intended by the law to relieve or excuse directors of banks from active vigilance on their part. It but emphasizes their duty in this regard.

The National Bank Act created the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. His duty, outside of each year reporting to Congress a summary of the condition of the national banks of the country, together with statistics of the State and savings banks, and suggesting any amendments to the laws by which the system may be improved, is to carry into effect the laws relative to the organization, the conduct, and the liquidation of every bank belonging to the system. His power of supervision results from his duty to see that the shareholders of a bank maintain unimpaired the capital stock of such bank. In order to do this intelligently he is empowered to appoint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, as often as shall be deemed necessary or proper, suitable person or persons to make an examination of the affairs of every banking association. The person so appointed has the power to make a thorough examination into all the affairs of the association, and in doing so he may examine, if necessary, any of the officers or employees thereof on oath. The result of such examination is made to the Comptroller in a full and detailed report. The examinations of national banks are made as a rule semi-annually unless the conditions are such as to require more constant supervision. Their object, while primarily to ascertain if the capital stock of the bank is impaired, is so extended as to prevent any irregularities, violations of law, misappropriation of funds, or mismanagement on the part of the officers of the bank. They design as far as possible to detect criminal violations of the law, where such have occurred, and thus prevent further loss to the depositors and stockholders. The examiners act entirely under written instructions from the Comptroller. They are required in all cases to make examinations without any notice to the bank and as unexpectedly as possible. They commence their examinations at either the close or commencement of the business of the day, as it would be impossible to make comparison of all the assets of the bank with the books while the business was in active progress. Upon entering the bank, the examiner takes possession of all of its assets and retains them until he has counted the cash and verified all of the items of stocks, bonds, loans, and discounts, and balances on the ledger and other books used. He counts the cash, examines the list of loans and discounts and collateral held therefor, notes all loans and discounts to directors and officers, and to enter-

prises in which they are interested. He also examines the list of all stocks, securities, etc., held by the bank and all real estate and mortgages held and owned by it. He takes off a balance of account of the individual ledger or ledgers, and verifies outstanding certificates of deposit, certified checks, and cashier's checks. He also takes off balance of stock ledger, examines stock certificate book, and profit and loss and expense accounts. He examines the minutes of directors' meetings, discount committee meetings, and shareholders' meetings. He examines into the condition of the lawful money reserve of the bank for the thirty days preceding the examination and compares the bank's copy of the last report of condition with its books at the same date. He is required to send out a verification circular on blanks furnished from the Comptroller's office to all banks to which or from which balances are due, to all parties from whom money has been borrowed on bills payable, certificates of deposit, or notes and bills rediscounted; to all parties to whom items have been sent for collection, and to all officials in whose name State, county, or municipal funds are deposited. Having done all this, he makes a report to the Comptroller of the Currency showing the character of the loans and discounts, the loans exceeding the 10 per cent. limit, the amount of overdrafts, the amounts of money borrowed by the officers and directors of the bank, the general character of the officials, the manner of the conduct of the bank, together with many other things unnecessary to be here enumerated. Upon the basis of this report letters of criticism are sent to the banks reported upon and an effort is made to have all matters at fault corrected. If the point is a serious one or the bank's condition a source of anxiety, letters are sent to the individual directors calling their attention to the letter of criticism sent the bank and a reply under the joint signatures of all is required.

In spite of all these precautions, and an honest attempt to enforce the provisions of the law, bank failures not infrequently occur, and defalcations are found. A search through the history of these failures, where there has been no dishonesty, but only imprudent and improvident banking, shows that in the majority of instances such banks engaged either in speculative enterprises or failed to receive attention from their directors. Bank defalcations, it has been found, are not less often due to inattention of

directors or unwarranted overconfidence on their part in the bank's employees, or unwillingness to adopt the best methods of bank bookkeeping. They are most frequently detected by the examiners in comparing the balances on individual ledgers with those on the general ledger, and by verifying the accounts with its correspondent banks and bankers. The verifying of the accounts with correspondents has brought to light in more than one instance false entries on the books made to cover defalcations. Here and there a bank over which the Comptroller has no supervision refuses to furnish the information requested, but such policy is a short-sighted one, and is an encouragement to wrongdoing. The balancing of individual ledgers has given rise on the part of the Comptroller's office to more criticism than any other one point in the management of banks, because where a system of ledger is used which does not show the balance of each account kept therein, it is of course impossible for an examiner without spending more time than is at his disposal to verify its correctness, and thus a defalcation may he covered up for an indefinite time. That such is the case is clearly shown by the fact that in many instances where banks have adopted a more modern form of ledger, in compliance with suggestions from the Comptroller's office, defalcations have been discovered which otherwise would still have been undetected. The recent defalcation on the part of the bookkeepers of the Union National Bank of New Orleans, which delayed long in carrying out the suggestion of the Comptroller for a change of books, was discovered in transferring the accounts of the bank from the old style of ledgers formerly used to the new ledgers suggested. The same thing occurred in the instance of The National Shoe and Leather Bank of New York City, where a large defalcation was covered up by fictitious entries on the individual ledgers. As a means of preventing defalcation on the part of bank officials, either aided by confederates within or without the bank, the importance of adopting a daily balance system of individual ledger, or at least a three-column ledger which will show the balance of each account every time it changes, cannot be overestimated. In this matter, however, as in many others the supervisory officer of the government can only suggest the necessity of it to those in charge of the bank. The law gives him no power to enforce his sug-

gestion. In some cases, when the danger is pointed out, the officers of the bank criticized resent the suggestion as not within the province of the Comptroller and wholly a matter for them to deal with. The balance of each depositor's account should be visible at a glance and a trial balance enabled to be taken off at any date with very little labor, so that a comparison of such trial balance could be made with the account of deposit on the general ledger, with which account the aggregate of balances should always agree. The best and final test, however, of the correctness of balances on the individual ledger, is a comparison with the same of the entries on the depositors' passbooks. The safety of a bank against defalcation, either through the act of a single official or through a conspiracy between accomplices, lies in frequently and regularly calling in such passbooks and having them compared with the ledger by some person other than the bookkeeper who makes the entries therein. Unless this test applied to passbooks is made, the directors of a bank have no guarantee, even with the best system of bookkeeping, that fraud may not be perpetrated. So, too, where more than one individual bookkeeper is employed, they ought to exchange ledgers from time to time without notice as an additional safeguard. In this connection it may be stated that this principle ought to be applied as far as possible to all the work done in a bank, as experience shows that the surest preventive against wrong-doing or dishonesty is some system which provides that the work of each officer or employee is verified and checked by a person other than himself.

It has been frequently suggested that the Bank Examiner ought, if he had called in the passbooks of the bank, to have discovered defalcations resulting from conspiracies between employees of the bank and outside depositors. The obstacle to this practice lies in the fact that it would consume more time in an examination than is practicable, and keep an examiner in a bank for so long a time that suspicion might be aroused as to its condition when no cause for such suspicion really existed. It would thus result that runs would be made upon banks, and perfectly solvent ones be compelled to close. It is not the duty of either the Comptroller or of his agent to attend to these details. It rests with the directors of the banks to insist that the executive officers whom they choose shall manage the bank with such care

that wrong-doing is impossible. It is also their duty to see that this is done. The directors of banks too often fail to realize the importance of the office which they hold. They ought diligently and honestly to administer the affairs of the association over which they preside. They have no right to leave the management of the bank to the president, or cashier, or both, but ought to insist on knowing what is being done, and how it is being done. They ought to make thorough and frequent examinations of the bank, both as to the honesty of its conduct and the solvency of the paper which it accepts. It is their business to know that the transactions of the banks with which they are connected are properly carried out, and that such methods of bookkeeping and checking of accounts are adopted as would effectually remove opportunities for dishonesty. They owe this much to shareholders who elect them, and to depositors and creditors who, relying upon their doing their duty, give credit to the institution they are attached to.

It is not improbable that better results would be obtained in the examination of banks if examiners were paid a fixed yearly salary with an allowance for expenses. The mode of payment now in vogue is in most places, outside of reserve cities, an allowance of a fee of twenty dollars for each bank examination. Out of this sum the examiner is required to pay both his traveling and his living expenses. In order to meet such expenses and leave a suitable compensation for his labor, he must of necessity examine a bank with more rapidity than in many instances he ought. There are cases where several days should be occupied in the examination of a very small bank, but the examiner cannot afford to give the necessary time. If, however, he was employed under a fixed salary paid out of a fund to be contributed by all the banks, together with the payment of his necessary expenses, each bank with which he had to do could receive the attention which it demanded.

In the last analysis, however, the proper conduct of a bank must result more from the acts of those entrusted with its keeping than from the acts of the officers of the law. If such bank officers are dishonest, careless, or indifferent, the best governmental supervision and the closest scrutiny of their acts will many times be thwarted. If such directors and officers fail to pay every attention to the conduct of the bank's employees out-

side of office hours as well as during them, they are apt at any time to be confronted with dishonesty and loss. They have no right themselves, nor have they a right to permit their employees, to indulge in speculation, whether it be upon the board of trade, the stock market, in real-estate subdivisions, or dubious manufacturing enterprises. The position which they occupy is so largely a fiduciary one that the community in which they reside has a right to expect of them the utmost care and prudence in both the keeping and the lending of the moneys which they handle. If they borrow from their own banks they should hold themselves to a stricter account as to security for their loans than they do to a stranger dealing with the bank, because they occupy the dual position of both lender and borrower. If they do not, they are apt to encourage wrong-doing among the bank's employees, engage in hazardous undertakings with the bank's funds, and ultimately involve the bank in scandal, themselves in disgrace, and the community in loss. The security of the bank depositor is certain to be maintained if bank officers and directors co-operate with the supervising officers and insist that both the spirit and the letter of the bank act be carried out. It can never be made absolutely sure, however, if the examining is all done by the governmental officers and none by the directors. Examinations by both, thorough and complete, are essential, and the depositor has a right to demand of the latter as much attention to official duty and official oath as of the former. He is entitled to the very best service of both.

JAMES H. ECKELS.

ELECTION TRIALS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES DILKE, BART., M. P.

It is difficult to compare the corrupt practices procedure of the United Kingdom with that of the United States. Each State of the Union has its own code, and there are great differences between State and State both in law and practice. It may, in fact, be said that there are 45 sets of election laws in the United States, and that they are being frequently revised year by year. It may, however, be of some interest even to American politicians, and to those who are concerned in purity of election, to explain the change in opinion which is taking place in Great Britain upon this difficult subject.

Some years ago, in consequence of the cost and of the unsatisfactory nature of election procedure on petitions questioning the return of members, jurisdiction in regard to them was transferred from the House of Commons to the judges. The original proposal was that each case should be tried by a single judge, but in consequence of the objections of the Irish members who feared partiality on the part of Irish judges, two judges were set to try each case. There were some of us who were always opposed to calling in the judges, and who believed that the Committee of Selection of the House of Commons would have been competent to construct a small Committee consisting perhaps of a partizan on either side, and of, say, three impartial members of high standing certain to give an unbiassed opinion in such cases. We feared that judges would insist on clear proof of some absolutely illegal act or act of corruption before they would unseat; and that no amount of evidence of doubtful practices at an election falling short of an established single clear case of a corrupt practice would secure the upsetting of a bad election. On the other hand, we feared that the clear proof of a single case of a corrupt practice would

cause the voidance by judges of an election which might on the whole have been conducted with honesty and due care. The latter of these two apprehensions has, by universal admission, been completely justified. The former of them has not been so fully justified; but the great cost of election petitions, and the fear of both parties as to the effect of revelations, continue to cause the most corrupt elections of all to pass without question. We have by the selection of a Judicial tribunal, and by the passing of an extremely severe Corrupt Practices Law containing a maximum scale of expenditure, managed to whitewash our elections, or in other words to make them look far purer and far less costly than they are. But although the new law gave us pure elections—and it must be remembered that it came into force along with the Redistribution Act which altered most of the constituencies in 1885 and 1886—the evils which formerly existed have revived, except so far as they were remedied by the extinction in 1885 of a great number of the smallest and most corrupt of the constituencies.

In the United Kingdom alone, of all countries in the world, there is still an enormous disparity in the size of the constituencies. Before 1885 the extreme disparity was in the proportion of 240 to 1. Immediately after the redistribution of 1885 the extreme disparity was 8 to 1: but in exceptional cases, such as those produced by a comparison of three of the smallest boroughs with two of the divisions of the county of Essex, they now exceed 10 to 1, and reach 12 to 1. This tenderness to very small borough constituencies causes the continued existence of some constituencies which have been corrupt throughout their history, except, perhaps, at the elections of 1885 and 1886, when agents and candidates were too frightened to bribe. Our last Corrupt Practices Law contained within it not only a maximum scale, but a solemn declaration by the candidate that he had not paid and would not pay any sum in excess of the sums publicly "returned" in much detail. It is obvious that little bribery would take place if these returns by candidates could be depended upon. It is also obvious that a candidate who will pay money, well knowing that it is meant for bribery, will not hesitate to sign a false declaration. Apart from bribery, and as regards the case of elections for county divisions in which bribery is probably unknown—as it is now in the large borough constituencies—candidates unfortunately are found willing to make false declarations

as regards total expenditure, and except in the case of scrupulous men the declaration is tending to become a mere form.

The judges never liked the duty which Parliament has thrown upon them ; and since the recent attacks which have been made upon the impartiality of some of them, and especially on those—one Liberal, one Conservative, and one Liberal Unionist—who have retained their membership of party clubs, they like it still less, if possible, than they did before. The government have promised that a select committee shall be appointed at the beginning of the session of next year to consider the whole question and to propose some change : and it is perhaps well to begin by suggesting the changes which will be recommended to this committee by some of those who have pressed for its selection.

The cost of the existing system by which the judges try the petition in the constituency affected is, though great, not so great as the cost of the old system, when the witnesses had to be kept in London. Is it possible to hit upon a combination of an improved form of the old procedure before Parliament with that which is best in the existing system, namely, local investigation ? It might be possible to send down to the locality a Statutory Commissioner, with power to make inquiries, to collect evidence, to hear the witnesses, and to report whether a *prima facie* case had been made out for trial, as well as what in that trial should be the issues to be investigated. At the present time the cost of the procedure is enormously increased by fishing inquiries of great length, which lead to no result, and hundreds of cases are started before the judges for one which is followed out to the end. Inquiry by a Commissioner would narrow the matter down to the points really deserving of decision by a competent tribunal. The ultimate trial might then be before the Parliamentary Inquisition. High character and perfect impartiality might be obtained for that tribunal if the Committee of Selection were directed to propose a very small committee, which would consist of men like Sir John Mowbray, Mr. Courtney, Mr. John Ellis, and others, of whom no member in the House of Commons would not at once recognize the integrity and the certainty of freedom from party prejudice in their decision.

It is difficult to go on as we are. After the last general election the cases of the most corrupt constituencies were as usual not brought up, while, as regards the others, a candidate has

lately been unseated on the sole ground that a trifling sum had been paid without his knowledge for a single railway fare; and a candidate on the other side unseated because a few shillings had been paid, also without his knowledge, for the bait of a horse that had brought in some voters. A case at Southampton in the last twelve months gave general dissatisfaction because one member was unseated, and the other standing along with him retained his seat—a dissatisfaction which I do not share, as I think that the ground given by the judges in this case was defensible. In the case of the St. George's division of the Tower Hamlets 352, and in the case of Lancaster 117, offences were alleged, but they were narrowed down to a very few, and an immense amount of money proved to have been wasted without result. The Lancaster case, however, clearly raised a matter, also raised at Lichfield and in other places, namely, as to when an election begins. When we were carrying the last Corrupt Practices Act we distinctly refused to fix the date, and insisted that it should be left to the election judges to consider each case upon its merits. This, however, is one of the points in which candidates are most anxious to be given a clear rule; in fact, they want the channel buoyed for them. It might be seen, however, that if any date were fixed such as that of the issue of the writ, or that of a certain time before the issue of the writ, almost all the expenditure of a rich candidate would be made to take place before the date which might be agreed upon. As it is, candidates are apt to "return" their expenditure only from the date of the issue of the writ, and to try to produce confusion as regards previous expenditure, between that which is election expenditure, as under the hypothesis it in fact all was, and that which is either registration expenditure, or general party political expenditure, and which is expressly lawful and not necessarily to be "returned."

Although the corrupt practices legislation of this country is subject on many heads to fierce onslaught at the present moment, it is on this point of date that it is especially attacked. It is pointed out that while the law limits the maximum expenditure of candidates, and insists on all expenditures being made public, it traps the candidate by not fixing when he becomes a candidate. When I was concerned with the then Sir Henry James in passing through Parliament the bill which forms the foundation of our

present law, it was, I repeat, our most special desire to abstain from fixing any such date. The objections from the point of view of candidates to having no date are obvious. The objections from the point of view of the public to having one are still more real. The moment a date is fixed candidates will everywhere, and to the greatest possible extent, spend as much money as possible before the beginning of their nominal candidature, and as little as possible after that date. The public are protected, so far as they have any protection, against the illegitimate use of wealth mainly by this existing uncertainty of the law. It may, however, be conceded that the whole of the maximum-expenditure plan has broken down, as indeed I always myself anticipated that it would break down after giving us one pure and cheap election. It may almost be cynically said that you can always obtain one pure and cheap general election by the process of passing a revolutionary Corrupt Practices Act, but that the ingenuity of agents and of candidates will prevent you from obtaining more than one upon a single act of Parliament, unless the machinery for hunting out and punishing abuses is greatly improved over the present plan.

The maximum scale is now exceeded everywhere—even in the purest county division—at every bye-election; and candidates and agents manage by some manipulation of figures to reconcile their "returns" to the obligations imposed by conscience. At a bye-election, when the rest of the country, electorally speaking, is quiet, all the party agents of both sides from all parts of the country are available. The result is that agents who notoriously would think themselves disgraced for working for less than a hundred-guinea fee, and whose able services are well worth the money, are found in dozens, instead of units, in the division, taking charge of little polling districts. At a general election, when nearly all well-worked constituencies are simultaneously fought, the average expenditure on each side is vastly less than at bye-elections, but the amount returned is about the same. On the other hand, at general elections, outside agencies, the expenditure of which is not returned at all, play a considerable part —for example, the licensed victuallers, who placard the country mainly on behalf of one political party, but no portion of whose large expenditure figures in any candidate's return.

It will be difficult under any system to prevent undue expendi-

ture by wealthy men under the guise of registration, and in the shape of subscriptions to charities, chapels, cricket clubs, foot-ball clubs, and the like. Bribery and treating, however, can be prevented; but the merger of those small borough constituencies which have been retained, by means of a further scheme of re-distribution, is a necessary step towards the abolition of direct corruption. There are boroughs remaining which are and always have been corrupt, and which will remain corrupt, so long as they continue to exist at all. A special class of candidates is generally found for them. There are men who will stand for them who will not stand elsewhere; and still more men who stand elsewhere and who will not stand for them. There were many such constituencies destroyed by the last Redistribution Act, and the county divisions in which they have been merged have swamped the corrupt elements and are free from direct corruption.

All friends of purity of election in my country ought to press not only for such a reform of our laws against electoral corruption as has been shadowed out above, but also for a further redistribution of seats.

It is not feasible to exactly redistribute seats in proportion to population. We cling to our borough boundaries and to our county boundaries. And it is impossible to arrive at equality of size in parliamentary constituencies without cutting through county and borough boundaries in forming parliamentary divisions. Without, however, destroying either county or borough boundaries, the existing discrepancies of ten or twelve to one could be reduced to discrepancies of, say, two or three to one. And if, even without redistributing seats in London, or Scotland, or in English or Irish counties, or large boroughs, we were merely to extinguish the separate representation of the smaller boroughs, and merge them in the surrounding counties, we should have abolished almost all the direct corruption that remains.

It may be said that the election petitions which followed the last general election did not concern the small boroughs, but dealt with county divisions and large towns. There were two cases in London; there was a case at Southampton; there was a case in Scotland; there were cases in two large English county divisions which appear to justify this view; but no direct corruption was proved, and little was alleged in these; whereas

we are all aware of the notorious existence, unchecked and unchallenged, of the grossest forms of corruption in some small boroughs, situate even in counties which adjoin London.

Ordinary bribery and treating are offences, the nature of which may be understood by their very names. There is one class of electoral offence which is peculiar to ourselves and which is worthy of very special notice. It consists in the payment of the travelling expenses of voters, or in the actual conveyance of voters to the poll. We have in this country an enormous class of non-resident voters. The great majority of the ownership voters in some divisions are still non-resident. The creation of purely incorporeal "faggot" votes is now forbidden. When first I entered upon political life I should have been able, as a lay impropriator of tithe, in several hardly fought county divisions, to have turned the election in each of them by dividing my holding among a number of stalwart politicians. This easy method of creating votes is now forbidden; but we still give a vote to the non-resident forty-shilling freeholder, although he has a vote in his own district where he lives. There are some Dons at the Universities, and there are some active politicians in London, who have qualifications of this kind in great numbers of county divisions. They are men of wealth, and they pay their own expenses when they go down to vote. In the case of my own constituency there are never less than two hundred working colliers, electors for the division, who are working in Wales, and few of those are able to pay their own expenses to come and vote, though some do so. If any person who may be sufficiently connected with me to be held in law to be my agent, without my knowledge, be appealed to by one of these men—both very likely being ignorant of the law—and sends him a railway ticket, I am unseated. It is a hardship or a dangerous risk, and careful candidates spend much of their time in guarding against it by personally warning every friend. To allow the payment of the expenses is to give overwhelming weight to the wealthy, but to forbid it as we now do seems hard to the voter, and is very dangerous to the innocent. The right remedy is a more purely residential suffrage such as exists in almost every other country in the world, so that we see how Election Petitions Law has carried us into redistribution of seats, and now carries us into franchise reform.

CHARLES W. DILKE.

HIGH BUILDINGS.

BY A. L. A. HIMMELWRIGHT.

THE tower-like structures that have sprung up as if by magic within the past few years in the business portions of nearly all our large cities are indeed wonderful creations. These buildings are remarkable not only because they are unique in proportions and exemplify novel methods of construction, but also on account of their vast commercial importance. Take, for example, any of the larger office buildings, such as the "Manhattan Life," or the "Washington," in New York City, and the "Marquette" or the "Rookery," of Chicago. Buildings such as these shelter a host of persons engaged in mercantile and professional pursuits, who, in connection with their various occupations and enterprises, often employ as many as eight to ten thousand persons. Assuming that there are the usual five persons dependent upon each adult wage-earning male, it will be apparent that many of these buildings in supplying the necessary accommodations for the transaction of business furnish the means of support for forty to fifty thousand souls. When it is remembered that many of these buildings occupy areas less than one hundred feet square, the enormous value of building lots in the best business centres can be appreciated.

The reduced cost of iron and steel since 1888–90, the perfection of elevator mechanism, and improved methods of fireproof construction have made the high buildings of to-day possible, as well as practicable and profitable. The old methods of construction, in which the walls were designed to carry the weight of the various floors and the roof, have been revolutionized, and the steel skeleton frame now supports the entire structure, including in many cases even the exterior walls. The improved elevator service renders the upper stories of a building almost as

accessible as those nearer the street level, while the former have usually the advantage of being better lighted and ventilated. As a result of these conditions, story after story has been added until twenty-story buildings are quite numerous, and twenty-five and twenty-eight story buildings are in the course of erection. Nor has the limit of the height of the steel skeleton-frame structures been even approximately reached. Buildings of fifty or sixty stories are evidently as feasible as those of thirty stories if the additional proportional cost of the foundations and structural iron should prove no obstacle to investors. Actual buildings of such enormous heights will, however, probably never be realized. This assertion is made, not on account of any apparent engineering or architectural difficulties, but because, sooner or later, there will be found a limit in the height of buildings depending upon many and varying conditions for each locality, beyond which they will no longer be profitable investments.

A few observant persons have discovered objectionable features in some of the high buildings. These have been publicly discussed from a prejudiced standpoint with the result that many regard high buildings with disfavor, and even with suspicion. They ask, "Are these buildings safe?" "Do they not shut out much-needed light and air?" "Will they not destroy the effect of beautiful architectural designs of adjacent buildings, and mar the beauty of our streets?" These are pertinent questions that may well command careful attention and study.

Antiquated laws framed before the advent of steel construction, neglectful owners, incompetent architects, unprincipled and careless builders, and the false economy of some of our municipal governments in failing to provide and maintain an alert and efficient building department—are all conditions that cannot fail to breed reckless as well as faulty construction. Occasional failures of buildings causing destruction of life and property are substantial proofs that at least some of these conditions exist in nearly every city. These failures, which are so eagerly snatched up and heralded by the daily press, are largely responsible for the popular but mistaken inference that all high buildings must necessarily be unsafe and possibly dangerous.

It may be stated authoritatively that when good and suitable foundations are provided, and the other details of the construction designed and carried out in accordance with the best modern

practice, the high steel frame building of to-day is absolutely safe under all physical conditions prevalent in this latitude.

The liability of iron and steel to oxidize (or rust) is the principal defect in this system of construction. To prevent this evil, the structural iron when erected is treated to one or more coats of paint. Special chemical processes are sometimes employed for a similar purpose. The protecting films thus produced, when composed of suitable substances and properly applied, are impervious to air and moisture and render oxidation impossible. When, later, the iron work is encased in masonry and plaster, its isolation from the atmosphere minimizes the danger of oxidation and practically eliminates it. There exist, however, in many buildings, local conditions favorable to oxidation which are unavoidable. To correct any possible damage that may result in such cases the ironwork is so designed that any part may be removed if desired and new material substituted. The length of time that paint or other coatings will remain effective under the various conditions that obtain in the average building has not as yet been determined. Until authentic information on this subject is available, extreme vigilance should be exercised and the ironwork inspected at regular intervals, not exceeding twenty years. In the best and more recent designs of high buildings, the ironwork is so disposed as to be readily accessible for inspection.

Another important feature which bears directly upon the subject of safety is the protection a building affords against fire. Previous to 1892 very little was known about practical methods of "fireproofing." It was assumed that, if all the materials used in the construction of a building were incombustible, the building would necessarily be fireproof. Small fires breaking out in such buildings, causing serious damage and occasionally wrecking the entire structure, have proved the fallacy of that assumption. In order that a building shall be fireproof it is not only necessary that the materials used shall be incombustible, but also that those materials shall be so adapted and employed to the best advantage, that they may effectually resist disintegration and retain their strength and firmness under all the conditions that may arise in the case of a conflagration and the subsequent operations of a fire department. Careful, conscientious study of the requirements and the observation of the effect of fire and

water on different materials have rapidly developed more efficacious methods in fireproof construction. The structural iron is now carefully encased and protected, the principle of air-spacing successfully and economically applied and all woodwork so far as practicable is replaced by stone, cement, metal, or glass. In fireproof buildings designed for business purposes the question of cost frequently precludes the use of the best materials. Until an equally low-priced substitute can be found, wood will be largely used for much of the interior finish and trimming. However undesirable this may seem in a fireproof building, actual fires have demonstrated that all the combustible material in several rooms may be consumed without any serious injury to the building, and that the fires are easily controlled and extinguished. The total damage in such cases is represented by the expense of replacing the consumed woodwork and furniture and restoring the damaged plaster.

The leading argument against high buildings is that they obstruct the light. Localities such as Nassau street, near Printing House Square in New York City, are pointed out as illustrating the wanton and exorbitant appropriation of sunshine and air. It is asserted that the high buildings at such places produce the effect of continuous walls on both sides of the narrow streets intercepting the light and rendering the streets dark and gloomy except for an hour or two at mid-day; that the offices and stores in the lower stories are dark ; and that the circulation of pure air is greatly impeded. While these assertions are undoubtedly true, their application is much more general than is here assumed.

Everyone who is famiiiar with lower New York and other closely built up sections of our large cities, is well aware that block after block of buildings presents a solid front on the streets. The depth of the buildings generally averages between sixty and ninety feet, the average frontage about twenty-five feet, and the average height, five to seven stories. These buildings, flanked on both sides by solid party walls, are wholly dependent for light upon the windows in the front and rear. In some instances additional light is obtained by means of sky-lights in the roof. The majority of these buildings are dismally dark and artificial light must invariably be resorted to whenever they are to be used for business purposes. Even four or five-story residences, built

under the same conditions, can boast of only a few well-lighted rooms in the front and rear, while the hallways and the interior rooms are gloomy and cheerless. When we find the same conditions as to light in four and five-story buildings as we do in extremely high ones, is it not evident that the problem of lighting must be largely independent of the height of the buildings ?

What, then, is the difficulty ? The answer is, faulty designing, primarily, and inadequate building laws. It is to be regretted that there are many architects (or more properly draughtsmen) who for a consideration are willing to smother whatever professional pride they may possess and, in opposition to their better judgment and good taste, cater to the vicious greed of unprincipled speculators and owners, Many of these speculators, intent upon securing the maximum floor areas, are entirely willing and often anxious to sacrifice light and ventilation to secure their object. Unfortunately the existing laws are not sufficiently definite or comprehensive to exercise the requisite corrective or prohibitory measures in such cases.

The question of light and air is, from a sanitary point of view, one of vital importance in the design of any building, be it a private residence, or a city hall. If the lot is bounded by high walls, it is distinctly the province as also the prerogative of the architect either to limit the area occupied by the building, or to introduce light shafts or courts suitable in number and size to afford sufficient light. The fact that there are so many poorly lighted buildings in all our large cities is conclusive evidence that the problem of light and air can only be regulated by judicious legislation. To arbitrarily limit the height of buildings in proportion to the width of the street on which they front, as was suggested in a bill recently introduced by a member of the New York State Legislature, would prove a serious blow to owners of real estate, and would certainly fail to correct a single one of the many flagrant evils that now exist. The bill serves, however, as an illustration of the vast amount of injury and the small amount of good that might result from bad legislation.

In Paris and Berlin a building may occupy only a certain prescribed proportion of the area of the lot on which it stands. A similar law exists in some of the larger cities of this country. These laws are very desirable in that they prevent the usurpation of space that is absolutely necessary for maintaining proper sani-

tary conditions. The building laws both here and abroad permit, however, the entire frontage of a lot to be built up solid. This, in my opinion, is the root of all the evil. A law should be framed prescribing that only a certain proportion of the total frontage in the middle of the lot may be occupied by a building. A passage for light and air would thus be provided between all buildings which would render each independent of any and all others as regards light. Such a law would have many other advantages. It would afford better protection against fire and would facilitate the operations of the fire departments. Many of the perplexing difficulties experienced by owners of adjoining properties, when excavating for new buildings, would be obviated. The necessary stability as regards the maximum wind pressures would, to a large degree, determine the width (generally the frontage) of high buildings. The higher the building, therefore, the greater would be its frontage and likewise the greater would be the space between it and adjoining buildings. A practical illustration may make this statement clearer. Assume that a law as suggested prescribes that a building may occupy 80 per cent. of the middle portion of the frontage of a lot, and 72 per cent. of its total area. Let us select a twenty-six story building that is to be 320 ft. in height above the street level. In order to be stable under the highest wind pressures that have been observed in this latitude, this building should have an average minimum width or frontage of about 40 ft. The lot would consequently have a frontage of 50 ft. If, similarly, a building with a front 20 feet wide occupied an adjoining lot having a frontage of 25 feet, the space between the two buildings would be 7½ feet. Again, if another building like the first were to be erected on a lot adjoining it, the space between them would obviously be 10 feet.

No more difficult problem has ever been presented to architects than the artistic designing of high buildings. When this problem is still farther complicated by the necessity of adapting the design so that it may harmonize with those of adjoining buildings, the task becomes well-nigh hopeless, and satisfactory results are seldom realized. If, on the other hand, all buildings were isolated, as is here proposed the utmost liberty of design and freedom of action would ensue. "The accomplished and experienced architect versed in all the historical practices of his

art, gifted with imagination, inventive powers and common sense," unembarrassed by adventitious circumstances, could summon all his resources and produce results at once original, artistic and effective. Nor would his creation be marred or robbed of the smallest part of its grace and symmetry by contact with other designs; but complete and distinct in itself, sovereign in the simple yet potent charms born of the master hand, it would stand forth in its full glory—a fitting monument to genius and skill.

Fifteen years ago the idea of constructing twenty-five and thirty story buildings would have been deemed too wildly improbable to deserve consideration. They are now realized. Some of the tall buildings that have been erected since that time are, from an architectural standpoint, unattractive; but many of the more recent ones are beautiful and desirable. What the next fifteen years may develop can scarcely be conjectured. Artistic and philanthopic minds, assisted by intelligent legislation, may accomplish what may now seem miraculous. Instead of buildings wretchedly lighted and ventilated, composing the solid, wall-like street fronts with scarcely any variation of sky-line, color or design, there may be structures perfect in their adaptation to the special purposes each is to subserve, separated from each other by smooth walks, well-kept lawns, blooming flower gardens and clean streets; representing in their designs all that is best in every style of architecture from the remotest ages to the present time, enriched and diversified by color, and varying in magnitude from the romantic single-story Swiss cottage with thatched roof, to the towering office buildings piercing the sky with a thousand "turrets and spires and gilded domes."

A. L. A. HIMMELWRIGHT.

GOVERNMENT BY PARTY.

BY GEORGE E. WARING, JR.

It is a fixed idea with most men that the government of the United States can be carried on only with the contest and alternating control of two opposing parties. Surely our past experience has shown that this idea is unfounded; or, to be more exact, that two great parties, contending for the control of public affairs, have proven a menace to our safety, a danger to our liberties, a source of corruption to the people, and a disgrace to the nation.

The traces of partisan strife are evident in our very early history, and there has been little in our policy, for a hundred years past, that was not tainted with the trickery, insincerity, or misplaced passion of political warfare. If those who have the right to vote had the virtue to vote honestly and the sense to vote intelligently, our case would be other than it is. There is clearly a capacity in the American people to turn out a majority for the right side, without regard to party, in great emergencies, but only in great emergencies. We are generally led by the nose; it is only in great crises that we can be trusted to do our own thinking and to think rightly. Mr. Lincoln is said to have said: "You can fool some of the people all the time, and you can fool all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time." The sad truth that underlies this shrewd statement is that the majority of the people can be fooled nearly all the time.

The basis of "politics" lies here. Each party has its own rank and file always in training for any work it proposes, and it devotes its chief energy to the capturing of the great floating vote that occupies the middle ground between the two, and that may carry the control to one side or to the other. A portion

of this vote means to be honest and must be deluded or converted; much of it is without conscience and must be bought —with good money or with promises—false or fair. The money and the promises are the munitions of the warfare, and they are used with the knowledge of the captains.

This is a severe arraignment of honored men who are the accepted leaders alike of "the grand old Republican party" and of those who pretend to follow "the great principles of Jeffersonian Democracy." That it is not too severe these men themselves know, when they stop to think; and it is known to unprejudiced observers of their conduct who have had an opportunity to learn the inner working of the party machinery that they control.

In this lies our danger, for no public interest is so vital, and no public honor is so sacred that one or other of the great parties will not follow its leaders in violating the honor or in sacrificing the interest to win an election, and to gain or to maintain control of the government.

The Republican party has trampled under its feet the honor of the enthusiastic and patriotic volunteers who rushed to fill the ranks of the army in the early days of the war, or who entered it from conviction afterwards, and who served out their full time faithfully; and it has burdened the people with more than the cost of the greatest standing army. It has done this by giving the name "The Defenders of the Union," and by paying more than a million dollars a year, to dead-beats, skulkers, bounty-jumpers, and deserters—and all to secure "the soldier vote."

The Democratic President has risked bringing the nation to the verge of war, and has spread disaster through thousands of happy and thrifty homes by the check to industry and peaceful enterprise which the threat of war must inevitably cause, much as he would play a trump card in a desperate game—and all "to fire the popular heart" in support of his administration.

In short it is rarely that any conspicuous act of President or Congress is done without an eye to its effect on party interests. If it is "good politics" it is done; if it is "bad politics" it is not done, no matter what the result to the real interests of the country. Those with whom politics is a business—or a game—may have their private convictions as to public policy, and if

they were not pursuing the business or playing the game they might be controlled thereby. But the "iridescent dream" of political virtue must be swept away when the business is in hand of carrying an election, or of fortifying the defenses of the party.

It is not possible to divide a great nation into two political camps and to marshal the forces at the polls without a "machine." If it is possible to have a party machine that will not work against the best interests of the people, the way to do so has not yet been found. What has saved us thus far has been our trained habit of accepting the result of an election as final. No matter how bad that result may be, we know that a worse one would come of rebellion against it. The result itself is very often most unsatisfactory, if not actually bad. It is almost never very good.

One serious trouble is that the people have no control over nominations to office; the machine attends to that. The form of the primary meeting may still be followed, but its spirit was crushed long ago. Nominations are made well in advance—usually on commercial principles—by the leaders of the small clique who "make up the slate." The primary is held—and it is held like a fort—so that any man who is entitled to take part in it must be able to contend with ruffians if he proposes to influence its action against the prearranged programme, for here the "heeler" reigns supreme, and he carries out his orders with brutal vigor. The slated delegates are chosen to the convention and the slated nominations are there made. All that the people can do is to choose between the boss-prescribed ticket of one party and that of the other. Even in making this decision their action is very dependent on the effect of bribery and of the skilful false presentation of issues.

It is not a pleasant picture.

The whole world is forced to accept the fact that the primary is controlled by the more brutal party workers, and that the decision of nominating conventions is too often subject to the control of bribery. The "better element" of the Republican party was helpless at the recent primaries in New York, and they rose in feeble and momentary rebellion against their decision, only to subside into meek acquiesence, to "take their medicine" and to swing into line at the tail of the evil procession. In June

I heard respectable gentlemen, returned from St. Louis, joking over the purchase of colored delegates from the South, gentlemen who would eject from their own offices and counting-rooms any men who were even suspected of holding light opinions as to commercial honesty.

The corrupting influence of all this infamy, and of its public condonation, reaches all classes, even the highest.

I once ventured to call the attention of a friend to some very unscrupulous conduct of a politician who stood high in the counsels of his party, and in the government. His only comment was: "He gets there all the same!" My friend is not only not a politician, he is a professional man of the best standing, and is held in high consideration. He had only absorbed the virus with which the community at large is so infected that no political crime is taken seriously, and that successful political trickery even gets its meed of appreciation for its cleverness. The effect of all this is not localized; it, and indifference to it, pervade every quarter of the country.

There is an old theory that, when the worst comes to the worst, what it is the fashion to call the sturdy yeomanry of the country will save us by its native honesty. This is nonsense. I have passed most of my life far from the great towns, where corruption is supposed chiefly to dwell, and much of it in agricultural occupations, and I do not hesitate to say that there is more ignorance of public affairs, and a keener disposition to regard them as a source of profit, among farmers than among those who live in cities—and that is not saying much for the latter class either. I once remonstrated with a very intelligent countryman, the owner of a Massachusetts farm on which he and his ancestors were born, who had become a local contractor in his suburban neighborhood. I told him he could not afford to go to the legislature, to which he had recently been elected, because without his management his two hundred laborers would lose him many times his salary as a member of the House. His reply was suggestive: "Why Mr. Wairn', you don't understand it; they dew say that a feller's vote is wuth a lot of money sometimes up there to Boston!" He was a shrewd man, but he had not the least conception of any thing but "smartness" in his deliberate purpose to sell himself for what he would fetch, and to fetch all he was worth.

If our regeneration is to depend on the farmer vote, we shall die unregenerate.

Is it anything but unscrupulous party management that has brought us to this pass? Is it anything but the controlling spirit of party that has brought us to the serious, but less serious, danger with which we are now confronted. If the Chicago platform wins in the coming election, it will not be because the majority of the Democrats believe that the free coinage of silver will be a benefit to the nation, but because they have been so enslaved by the party that they are afraid to step out and vote as individual men, with individual opinions and individual consciences. The result may be financial disaster.

And what is the source of all this woe? Nothing under heaven but the game of one of the parties to ensure its long control of the Senate by admitting mining camps as States, in the fatuous belief that the Senators thus brought in would follow the lead of their Eastern pals. This game was played as "good politics," but it has lost. There is some ground for the hope that the rift made by these wild recruits will widen and spread until we shall be rid of this party; and the hope is not altogether desperate that the other as well may find its vanishing point in the next election. If either or both these boons should be vouchsafed to us, we may have a period of political virtue from which something may be gained. New parties always begin by being good, and it takes some years for them to become reduced to the mere winning of elections as their chief aim and purpose.

It has not been possible, in this sketch of the situation, to do more than to hint at the evidence of its seriousness; but evidence is not needed. Everybody knows, though not everybody will admit it, that the case is as is here set forth. Politically, there is no health in us.

The very serious question arises: What shall be done to open the way to a better method of government? Government of the people, by the party, for the party, is a failure. But this country is not a failure, and it will surely hew out its way to some safe system. This way has been opened by the almost universal extension of the Civil Service regulations, which withdraw from the parties the control of public offices, and the consequent means of bribery which held the workers of the party together by "the cohesive power of public plunder." It is no longer worth while to

work for a political leader because of the rewarding salary such as he was formerly able to promise. The enormous fraudulent section of the pension list still remains, but this will not last forever. Even the young widows of veterans will die sooner or later; and many pensions now paid must surely be saved when Congress dares to open them to the light of day by requiring the whole local pension list to remain exposed at every post office in the land. Sheer shame will lead many a pensioner to take his name from the rolls when it is laid bare to the gaze of neighbors who know his demerit; and neighbors themselves will rise up in their wrath to put an end to palpable frauds.

More, however, is to be hoped from a change that is fast coming over the population of the country. The rapid growth of towns and cities as compared with the rural districts will before many years bring the majority of voters within the reach of influences which must have an improving effect. Already over thirty per cent. of the population of the country is living in towns of 8,000 and upwards, and this percentage is increasing with great rapidity. At the present rate of growth it will not be more than a few years before the fifty-per cent. mark will be passed; then the remote purchasable or deludable vote will lose its control. It is not meant by this that the vote of the town is by any means virtuous, but it is better than the scattered vote of the country, and it is much more subject to the influence of argument and example.

It is no longer questionable that our municipal government is destined to be greatly improved at no distant time. The leaven is working all over the land, and it is hardly too much to say that the reform that has taken root in the city of New York cannot fail of very wide influence. It is the fashion to say that reform in New York is a failure, but this is not true. It is not yet an unqualified success, but it has made a mark that is sure to last. It is true that it has taken a firmer hold in some of the departments than in others, but it is also true that it pervades them all to a marked degree. No unprejudiced man can study the condition of the city to-day, as compared with the condition of two short years ago, without acknowledging the great improvement in tone, in method, and in effect. It is true that some officials still try to fill the places in their control with political adherents, but it is also true that their power to do so

is blocked by the Civil Service requirements of the new State constitution, and by the regulations of the State and city Civil Service boards. To-day no payroll can be accepted by the Comptroller of New York City unless it bears the certificate of the Commissioner of the department from which it emanates that all persons named in it who are subject to Civil Service rules have been employed in accordance with these rules, and also the certificate of the Civil Service Commission that it has examined the lists and has found this to be the case. Removal, except for statutory cause, is now prohibited, and appointments can be made only from the eligible lists, based—except in the case of laborers—on competitive examination. Thus the greatest source of political corruption is dried up, and we are rid of the class of public employees who had most to do with the subjection of the government to partisan politics.

The department that most affects the tone and character of the city government is that of the police. In spite of a law that should never have been allowed to become a law, and which is full of unfortunate limitations, the police is now vastly less objectionable than it was at the time of the Lexow investigation. So far as the Commissioners are concerned, the majority of the Board are efficient, save for the obstacles put in their way by the law ; their action is controlled by honest intentions, and they are working out the regeneration of the force surely, if slowly. The same is true in high degree of most of the other departments.

I venture to instance the Department of Street Cleaning because it is the one I know most about, and because it was possible to change its character more easily and more completely than any other—partly because it is organized under a better law and partly because Mayor Strong has steadily sustained its Commissioner in his determination to divorce it completely from all political control and influence. Still greater help has come from an almost universal desire on the part of the public to have municipal work carried on for its own sake and not for the sake of any party. The change was not secured without a struggle, but it was absolutely secured, and it is safe to say that the public is more than satisfied with it. This much of the city government is now, save for its high rate of wages, carried on on purely business principles and with the happiest results. The politicians acquiesce, perhaps perforce, in the change that has been made,

and they would hardly dare attempt to return it to its former condition.

Herein lies good ground for the belief that when the people are given the same example of non-partisan management in the other departments, they will insist on continued independence of party in all municipal work. Such an example set by the greatest city of the country must inevitably be followed, in time, by similar independence in all other municipalities, and it will dawn on the better classes of the whole American people that a system that has succeeded in the towns can—and should—be adopted for the nation. It is not to be supposed that all men will think alike, nor that difference of opinion will not lead to difference of aim; and this will mean division at the polls. But men will not always herd together under worn-out party banners, nor will they, in the name of issues long dead, vote for men whose only purpose is to get office and to distribute spoils.

If there is a wide division, it will be between those who seek their own profit and benefit, and those who seek the good of the people. One need not be a blind optimist to believe that the ultimate effect of education and civilization will be to give the permanent victory to the latter.

Let us remember always that not more than one voter in five hundred is a politician, and let us hope that the five hundred will in time be able to emancipate themselves from the domination of the one.

GEO. E. WARING, JR.

ENGLISH EPITAPHS.

BY I. A. TAYLOR.

Dr. Johnson, in a contribution to the *Gentleman*, expresses his surprise that so little interest had been shown, at the time of his writing, in the subject of epitaphs. For since, as he observes a little grimly, while few indeed can expect to furnish matter for an heroic poem each one may confidently look forward to being recorded in an epitaph, it becomes no less the interest than the duty of every man to see that a branch of business in which he has so intimate and personal a concern is properly carried on.

It was possibly the motive suggested by the doctor which directed the labors of a very different writer, for there still exists, though a little out of sight, a thin and well intentioned volume, in which Mr. Augustus Hare, to meet a need and correct a scandal, designed to provide a collection of epitaphs by which the dead might be commemorated in more fitting fashion than he had found to be commonly the case. Whether the attempt, however praiseworthy, was one likely to meet with success is, it is true, doubtful. A shop for ready-made garments is not the place where men's living bodies are best fitted, and it does not at the first blush appear why the dead should be expected to range themselves in more convenient classes for wholesale and appropriate ticketing.

On closer inspection, however, it becomes clear that Mr. Hare's purpose was not wholly concerned with the dead. In his opinion the object of an epitaph is threefold. It should indeed commemorate the departed, but it should also comfort the living, and teach a lesson to the general reader. And of these three aims one cannot but be conscious that the importance of the first is not a little subordinated to that of the remaining two, and that, even in this matter of sepulture, the living have been

given an undue advantage over the dead. Nor, whatever may be said of the generosity of the principle, can it be called less than just when we remember that each man's turn to take the second place awaits him, and that if his friend has distanced him in the involuntary race, it is certain that he himself, to borrow a phrase from one of these inscriptions, is "posting after."

In Dr. Johnson's opinion, at any rate, it was also the primary office of an epitaph to set virtue in the highest light, to exalt the reader's ideas and to rouse his emulation—to entrap unawares, in fact, the idle wanderer among the tombs, and compel him to confess that he has not, by remaining outside the church, escaped the sermon.

These, however, are but theories, and it is in the epitaphs themselves that must be sought the key to the place they have actually filled in the lives of men, to the longings and instincts of which they are the outcome and the result. And going to the epitaphs themselves, although the desire of reading a lesson to the living may find a more or less prominent place among them, there is surely another and more urgent craving to which the first rank should be given among the causes accountable for the innumerable monuments of the dead which cover the land. They are not merely so many school books or sermons in brief; they are, above and beyond these, the proclamation of a universal brotherhood, the cry of man to man, known and unknown, living or unborn, for pity, on the score of a common humanity, and a common mortality. "I was alive and am dead—be sorry for me," cry the dead. "I had and I have lost—be sorry for me," cry the living. And because—it is almost as if a menace entered in, and compassion were demanded at the point of the bayonet—because you will soon be in like case.

All through this literature of the graveyard the same appeal, for pity and remembrance, is made; whether with tragic dignity and poignant force; or through the doggerel, trite, or jesting, or pathetic, of a lower sphere; or even with the pedantic and lengthy grandiloquence which marks the panegyrics of the eighteenth century.

For whatever was the indifference complained of by Dr. Johnson, the time when he wrote was one when epitaphs were, if not at their best, at least at their longest; possibly indeed, since brevity was in his opinion most chiefly to be desired in such

commemorations of the dead, the very long-windedness of his contemporaries may have led him to wish to direct their attention to earlier and better examples of the art. If a man is great enough, it is an insult to his memory to be over explicit concerning his claims to remembrance; if deeds deserve to be remembered, they will be remembered; if not, let them be forgotten—such is the dictum of the stern old lexicographer. But this is surely to place too high an estimate on human justice, and those who set themselves to guard the memory of the dead may be pardoned if they prefer rather to act upon the warning of Sir Thomas Browne, that "the iniquity of oblivion blindly scattereth her poppy, and deals with the memory of men without distinction to merit of perpetuity."

Whichever philosopher may be right, the eighteenth century, and to some extent the preceding one, was certainly a time when no one with any self-respect could be buried without taking the proper steps to let posterity—that posterity to which, surely by some mistake, Anne Spragge's grave at Chelsea is declared "sacred"—know all that was to be known about him, without acquainting it with the list of his virtues, his talents, his bad fortune and his good. There indeed the register stops short, for with some noteworthy exceptions and so far as the better classes are concerned, a decent veil is drawn over the faults and follies of those who lie below: and when here and there we catch sight of something not commending itself to modern taste as wholly admirable, it is mostly accidental, and not due to any intentional or deliberate betrayal on the part of the biographer. If, for instance, the "Conjugal Affection" shown by Baptist Noel, Viscount Campden, to four wives, and his paternal indulgence towards nineteen children, for which astonishing record, achieved at the comparatively early age of fifty, he is held up to the "Admiration of his Contemporaries and the Imitation of Posterity"—if these items in his panegyric no longer strike the reader precisely as they were intended, that is not the fault of the composer, but of an alteration in public sentiment for which he is in no way responsible.

Anne Spragge, on the contrary, the singular dedication of whose grave has just been mentioned, had plainly forestalled modern ideas on more subjects than one. "For a considerable time," it is recorded on her tombstone, "she declined the Matrimonial State, scheming many things superior to her Age and

Sex, and under the Command of her Brother, with the Arms and in the Dress of a Man, she approved herself a true Virago, by fighting at sea . . . against the French." Alas! even Anne Spragge, before quitting this life, had suffered decline. She returned safe from that naval engagement only to fall a victim to fate like any common woman, to marry some months later, live half a year "extremely happy," die on the birth of her first child, and have a monument raised to her memory by a "disconsolate husband"!

Where crime was on so grand a scale as to constitute in itself a distinction the usual reticence was not, of course, observed; and upon the marble stone beneath which were laid, on his execution, the remains of Claude Duval, the celebrated highwayman, his titles to honor are recounted with a fine disregard of conventional morality, in the lines which end, "Old Tyburn's Glory, England's illustrious Thief; Du Vall, the Ladies' joy, Du Vall, the Ladies grief."

If, however, as far as *bona fide* tombstone inscriptions were concerned there was little but good to be learnt of the dead, the omission was amply supplied in those epitahs not intended for practical use, of which the composition constituted a distinct and favorite branch of literature. There are, indeed, few more signal and powerful examples of invective than are to be met with amongst them, as, for instance, in the magnificent arraignment of Francis Charteris by Dr. Arbuthnot, concluding with the words:

"Who with an inflexible constancy, and inimitable uniformity of life Persisted, In spite of Age and Infirmity, In the practice of every human vice——"

or, to cite an example in verse, in the four lines, not always to be found included among his works, by which Byron has rendered the memory of Castlereagh immortal:

"With death doomed to grapple,
Beneath this cold slab he
Who lied in the Chapel *
Now lies in the Abbey."

Whatever may be thought of the employment of such weapons against those no longer in a position to return the blow, there is a sort of justice in their use when they are turned, as in

* The House of Commons was formerly St. Stephen's Chapel.

Bettersworth's lines, against such a past master in the art of invective as Swift himself :

> "Here lies one Swift, one Harley's master tool,
> Spendthrift or wit, who died at length a fool,
> Who for his jest ne'er spared or friends or foes;
> He's gone—but where—the Lord of Oxford knows."

Of more brutal abuse the lines upon Coleman, a "plotting Papist" of the reign of Charles the II., may serve as an example:

> "If Heaven be pleas'd when sinners cease to sin,
> If hell be pleas'd when sinners enter in;
> If earth be pleas'd when ridded of a knave;
> Then all are pleas'd, for Coleman's in his grave."

There were few literary men by whom the trade of epitaph writing was not in some measure plied, and Cowley, Waller, Dryden, and Pope had quite a crowd of lesser imitators. Sir John Beaumont was evidently popular in this line of business—a fact to which he draws attention in the lines on his "deare Sonne, Gervase," asking,

> "Can I who have for others oft compiled
> The Songs of Death, forget my sweetest child?"

a composition which contrasts curiously with that of Ben Jonson—another epitaph writer, but this time a poet too—on a similar occasion :

> "Rest in soft peace, and, asked, say here doth lie,
> Ben Jonson his best piece of poetrie."

That the trade in epitaphs was by no means confined to London or to the higher grades of society, but existed in rural places as well, there would be no reason to doubt, even in the absence of such evidence to prove it as that furnished by the story which relates how Ralph Gittins, "*bell-man and epitaph-maker*," having been unwarily committed to prison by Sir John Bridgman, president of the marches of Norfolk, soon afterwards availed himself of the opportunity of vengeance afforded him in his enemy's death by the couplet,

> "Here lies Sir John Bridgman, clad in his clay,
> God said to the Devil,—'Sirrah, take him away.'"

The functionary entrusted with the duty of providing fitting tombstone inscriptions was, in fact, probably as indispensable an adjunct to village life as the sexton himself, the chief qualifica-

tions for the office being apparently a power of rhyming, ingenuity in the tricks of punning and word-play, with a certain amount of that broad humor which not infrequently strangely converted the memorials of the dead into elaborate jests. And if invention should run dry, there was doubtless a large assortment of stock verses from which it would go hard but an adaptation might be made to suit the case in hand. So at least go to prove the variations from common originals, such as the verse, which at seaside places record, with slightly different wordings how the dead sailor or fisherman or boatman has started on his last cruise, "our Admiral Christ to meet," or the varying forms of that most pathetic quatrain which in St. Paul's Cathedral relates of the sleeper below that

> "Whether he laughed, whether he cried,
> Nobody smiled, nobody sighed ·
> Where he is, and how he fares,
> Nobody knows and nobody cares."

Sometimes, indeed, it would seem that the person charged with the task of adaptation was guilty of scamping his work. There is a stone in Cumberland raised in the fourteenth century by Deborah Harrison to her husband Augustus. But the name had proved too much for the local versifier, and the rhyme affixed stands thus :

> "My husband lyeth dede
> Ondyr thys ston ,
> Dethe came to he, and seyde
> Oh ! Oh ! John."

While the broad characteristic of an appeal for pity and remembrance belongs alike to all ages, the terms of the demand naturally differ according to time and circumstance. In some of the earlier English epitaphs it is the dead themselves who cry from their graves for compassion and, with an urgency not to be mistaken, make their passionate appeal for help and succour. In the realization of their supreme necessity that of the living is forgotten :

> "For God's sake praye to the Heavenly King,
> That he my soul to Heaven wolde bring ;
> All theye that Preye and make Accorde
> For mee, unto my God and Lorde,
> God place them in his Paradice
> Wherein noe wretched Caitiff lies."

Give and it shall be given to you—one observes the principle.

Nothing for nothing would seem to be an instinct in human nature, even under circumstances into which it would not have been expected to enter :

"In the yere of Christ, on Thousand Fowr Hundry'd ful trew, wyth fowr and Sixteen, I Richard Skypwith, Gentyleman in Birth, late Fellow of Newe Inne, In my Age Twenti on, my Soul party'd from the Body :
And now I ly her, abyding God's Mercy, under this Ston in Clay ;
Desiring you that this sal see,
Unto the Meyden pray for me,
That bare both God and Man,
Like as you wold that other for yee shold,
When ye ne may nor can."

Another characteristic of some of these early inscriptions is the tender commemoration, not only of the spiritual part of those lost to sight, but even of the fair qualities of the perishable body. Thus we read that Anne, the wife of Richard II., was "of a comely Person, and a mild, lovely countenance" ; and "monsieur Edward," the Black Prince, from his tomb in Canterbury Cathedral, after lamenting his past greatness and riches, goes on to complain :

"My Beautye great is all quite gone,
My Fleshe is wasted to the Bone,
My house is narrow now & thronge,
Nothing but Truthe comes from my tongue.

And if ye should see mee this Daye,
I do not think but ye wolde saye
That I had never beene a man,
So moche altered nowe I am !"

The explanation is not far to seek. In those days faith was strong. The body was not lost and done with forever, but only temporarily gone into eclipse. The very eyes that were shut would open again, the dust-filled ears hear, the "mild, lovely countenance" recover its old beauty. It was an age when the spiritual and material met and touched. The intimate, and, as it were, personal relationship between God and man, lingering on even to a later period, finds expression now in the half-apologetic mention of the honorable death of Humphrey Bourchier, only to be lamented because it took place on the day when Christ rose from the dead, like a funeral crossing a wedding party; now in the lines which, recording the death of Lettice, Countess of Leycester, on Christmas day, explains that

"Christ did to Heaven her soul convey
To solemnize his own Birthday,"

with a glad confidence that the festival would receive additional grace from her presence.

Passing on from the earlier examples, the personality of the survivors becomes more apparent in the monuments they raise. The list of the virtues of Lady Joyce Lucy is "set down by him, That best did know what hath been written to be true"; Lord Godolphin's "much-obliged daughter-in-law" erects his tomb; a "Friend's Friend" is responsible for Walter Harris' monument at Chelsea; the mother of Esther, Lady Eland, "herself almost buried in Sorrows," makes her daughter's sepulchre; and the inscription upon Thomas Clere's grave at Lambeth ends with something like a sob—

> "Ah, Clere! If Love had booted case or cost,
> Heaven had not won, nor Earth so timely lost."

About some early inscriptions there is an element of grim and uncompromising realism from which later times might shrink: "In this house, which I have borrowed of my brethren the worms, do I lye," says the sometime Bishop of the Isle of Man, from his tomb in his cathedral. "Reader, stop; view the Lord Bishop's palace and smile."

Equally distinct from the lengthy panegyrics of the eighteenth century and from the tender diffusiveness of other memorials, which seemed to take the world into the confidence of the mourner, is the poignant brevity of such inscriptions as the two words "Eheu, Evelina!" or such as these "Phillip Massinger, a Stranger;" as that of Wilkes on himself "A Friend of Liberty;" or, to take an example from fiction, "Alas, poor Yorick!" which, striking a single note, leave the rest a blank. Among such, though not coming under the head of English epitaphs, it is impossible to refrain from quoting the stone which, at Milan, simply adds to the name of the dead the words, "*Qui nunquam quievit, quiescit. Tace!*" Never quiet before, he is quiet now. Silence! Lest the restless spirit should wake and the restless brain begin to work. Surely the whole history of the man, in those few words, is told. "If he sleep he shall do well."

To the same category, so far as the note of singleness is concerned, though differing widely in other respects, belong such verses as the pitiful lines quoted by Nathaniel Hawthorne:

> "Poorly lived, Poorly died,
> Poorly buried, And nobody cried,'

or the doggerel, alike pathetic and jocose, which in St. Alban's Churchyard tells how

> "Hic jacet Tom Shorthose, sine tomb, sine sheets, sine riches,
> Qui vixit sine gown, sine cloak, sine shirt, sine britches."

The tone of stolid if not complaisant aquiescence in the nakedness of poor Tom's lot, past and present, contrasts with the inscription which, on Samuel Butler's tomb at Westminster, recounts that in order "that he who, when living, wanted almost everything, might not, after death, any longer want so much as a tomb, John Barber, citizen of London, erected this monument."

Such *post mortem* atonements are probably not infrequent, and it will never be known of how many sepulchres remorse has been the architect; but to have wanted "almost everything" was possibly too common a fate among the class to which Tom belonged to seem to plain country folk to demand any special after-death compensation.

It is probably with inscriptions of the type of these last—inscriptions, it must be confessed, not always restrained by decorum and often scurrilous or merry or scoffing—that Mr. Hare has his quarrel, though he may likely enough include in it such well-intentioned blundering as that perpetrated on the stone which, raised to the memory "of our beloved parents," adds the question, "What is home without them? Peace, perfect peace." And doubtless from his own point of view there is no little justification for the disapproval with which he views a large number of such memorials. And yet how ill could they be spared—how worse than inadequately would the quotations he suggests from such writers as Mrs. Hemans, Mrs. Barbauld, Bishop Heber, and the rest, supply the place of these epitomes of the life stories of those who lie beneath the stones. For here, as nowhere else, we are brought face to face with the past, till by a paradox it seems to rise, clothed in flesh and blood, from among the tombs.

Here, for instauce, is Lady O'Looney, "bland, passionate and deeply religious. Also she painted in water colors and sent several pictures to the exhibition. She was first cousin to Lady Jones—and of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." A Paradise made up of persons of quality who dabbled in art!

And here is the hypochondriacal old maid "who'd many aches and fancy'd many more," and died at last, "leaving her Pothicary quite forlorn," and one Johnson, "a painful preacher";

and another clergyman, surely not less so, who composed 500 sermons and preached more than 5,000 times! Here, too, is a couple who in death were not divided —

"She first departed, he for one day try'd,
To live without her; lik'd it not, and dy'd,"

and a cheerful if arbitrary assumption on behalf of a "very wicked man" killed by a fall from a horse—

"Between the stirrup and the ground,
I mercy ask'd, I mercy found."

And here are babies, many and various; an "incomparable boy," who died at birth; another who, having lived two years, tells us both why he came and why he left:

"The railing world turn'd poet, made a play,
I came to see it, dislik'd and went away";

and yet another infant, less easily persuaded of its good luck in dying, yet who, after some demur, allows itself to be convinced.

And then here and there among the rest, commonplace or jesting or trite, is struck some note, weird or discordant, like the verse in the Cornish churchyard:

"Here I lie without the walls,
Because there is no room within,
They kept such brawls;
Here I lie and have no rent to pay,
And yet I lie as warm as they."

Was it at the dead Lords of the Manor, arrogating to themselves sole right of burial within the sacred precincts, that the thrust was made, with its allusion to Death, the Leveller? However that may be, over respect for the dead was no invariable rule. Once leave behind the classes and places where decorum and grandiloquence reigned and a marked change is observable with regard to the sins and follies of those who are gone; and there is no lack of mention of them, whether in a spirit of coarse buffoonery or of deprecating apology. Thus we are told, in negative terms of condemnation, that under the stone at Cheshunt,

"Lies the body of Richard Hind,
Who was neither ingenious, sober nor kind;"

and at Great Cornard, in Suffolk, that,

"Here lies the body of Joe Sewell,
Who to his wife was very cruel,
And likewise to his brother Tom
As any man in Christendom.
This is all I'll say of Joe,
There he lies and let him go."

One wonders why, since nothing better could be said of poor Joe, the survivors, doubtless wife and brother, should have been at the trouble and expense of raising a monument to commemorate his shortcomings, but they were not singular in the course they took, nor are other records of unhappy marriages wanting.

"Cy gist ma femme, fort bien
Pour son repose ce pour le mien"

is a couplet at Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, as trenchant, though more laconic than the verse at Midhurst which records that—

"Beneath this stone
Lies my wife Joan,
To H—ll she's gone, no doubt;
For if she be not,
If Heaven's her lot,
I must (God wot) turn out."

An elaborate play upon words was a favorite form of memorial when the name of the dead invited such punning; and there is in Lincoln Cathedral a cheerful forecast as to the future lot of a divine named Cole. "*Cole* now *raked up in ashes* then shall *glow*," and a more sinister quatrain elsewhere in memory of one Sullen:

"Here lies John Sullen, and it is God's will
He that was Sullen, will be Sullen still.
He still is Sullen: if the truth you seek,
Knock until Doomsday, Sullen will not speak."

In Horace Walpole's manuscript there is a copy of an epitaph of the kind to be found near Salisbury, on a person named Button:

"O Sun! Moon! Stars! and ye Celestial Poles!
Are Graves then dwindled into Button-holes."

A joke based upon the profession practised by the dead was also a popular form of memorial. A blacksmith was thus said to have been "hotly employed in the service of his country. . . He made a great noise in the world till . . . death put out his fire, and here are laid his dust and ashes"; the reader is reminded, in lines commemorative of a huntsman, that

"The leap though high, from earth to sky,
The huntsman we must follow;"

and a billiard marker was said to be gone "for the long rest."

Nor were inscriptions of the kind confined to country places. The epitaph of Havard the comedian ends with the lines,

"The noblest character he acted well,
And Heaven applauded—when the curtain fell."

The fashion of the world changes, and the trade of the epitaph-maker grows slack. Here and there, it is true, some one is still honored after the old custom, but for the most part a text, appropriate or the reverse, a brief record of birth and death, a word or two of vague and general significance, with possibly a simple expression of regret, have replaced in our modern cemeteries those shorthand histories of the dead, tragic or humorous, tender or severe,

> "Some stained as with wine, and made bloody,
> And some as with tears,"

which formerly marked their resting places.

It is not that in these later years men have lost that craving for remembrance which, as old as life itself, is so vain, in the case at least of the commonality of the race, that it might well be a subject for laughter were it not that what, seen from without is purely grotesque, assumes quite another complexion when it is touched by our own personality. It is not that the desire to be remembered is gone, and it is likely enough that in some fashion or another we should all still be epitaph-makers, for ourselves or other people, if we had not lost faith in the permanency of the work. But time brings involuntary wisdom. "Our fathers find their graves in our short memories, and sadly tell us how we may be buried in our survivors." "While I live," promises a lover, with melancholy truthfulness, in a Roman epitaph quoted by Mr. Pater—"while I live you will receive this homage: after my death, who can tell?" And so it comes to pass that, submitting to the inevitable, men learn to limit their aspirations, and to content themselves, by way of epitaph, with the "two narrow words, *Hic jacet*," with which, says Sir Walter Raleigh, "eloquent Death" covers all.

I. A. Taylor.

THE ANIMAL AS A MACHINE.

BY ROBERT H. THURSTON, DIRECTOR OF SIBLEY COLLEGE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

THE vital system, in spite of the study bestowed upon it from the days of Plato and of Aristotle, and by the most acute of modern men of science, remains to-day the most mysterious of all the wonders of creation. It embodies the representative energies of all the realms of nature. The chemist, the physicist, the engineer, the biologist, the sociologist, the student of mental philosophy, and the moralist,—all thinkers and investigators in all departments of science—find here problems as yet absolutely defying solution, enigmas of sphinx-like obscurity and of infinitely more than sphinx-like antiquity. They stand perpetually before us, challenging and tantalizing us by their familiar externals, by their always mysterious internal operations. All that we really know is that every animal, human or other, from the greatest of scientific men or the most famous statesman down to the most insignificant worm or almost protoplasmic organism, is a machine of marvellous intricacy and astonishing perfection; self-perpetuating; self-repairing; capable of performing tasks of the utmost difficulty as a "prime motor," and as a vehicle for the contained and directing soul; automatic in its essential internal movements; competent to conduct all those unseen and mysterious operations often for years, for decades, sometimes for a century and more, without the slightest knowledge on the part of the imprisoned mind, of their character, of their method or of their mutual relations.

The mind of the individual thus confined in the organism, however lofty and intelligent, is usually unaware, by any sensation, whether these internal transfers and transformations of energy are going on at all or not, and, as a rule, the more perfect

their action, the less the consciousness of their operation. In most cases, the very existence of an organ is unknown to the possessor until its action is, by some derangement, rendered imperfect. Physical, chemical, vital, and intellectual forces and powers are all utilized and illustrated in the movements and accomplishments of this miracle among miracles; and the mind resident in the very midst of its marvels, after unnumbered centuries and millenniums, has learned almost nothing of the modes of action of any one of its internal energies. It even still puzzles itself with the question: Is the vital machine thermo-dynamic, thermo-electric, chemico-dynamic, chemico-electric, or a linked chain of chemical, physical, and dynamic powers, united with vital energies having as yet undiscovered characteristics?

There is little, if any, doubt that there exist in the vital organism forces and energies which scientific research has not yet touched; but it may be that, aside from the initial vital powers and those of the soul and the intellect, the animal machine may illustrate simply the transformation of only well-known forms of energy through processes wholly or in part unfamiliar. But, whatever may be the fact in this regard, it may probably be safely asserted that in this machine, as in any and every other, "nothing is produced from nothing," and every manifestation of energy comes of the transfer or transformation of some antecedent energy of equivalent amount. Whatever the outgo of the system, there must be an equivalent income of energy in that or other and transformable kind. This is the first of the laws of the science of "energetics," a science which underlies every phenomenon in the organic world and every department of nature in which motion occurs. It is a fundamental law to which no exceptions are known and to which no exceptions are believed to exist. But it is supposed—though by no means proven or certain—that we know just what enters this "prime mover" and vital machine, and as exactly what is rejected from it or produced by it.

This is certainly true, so far as the familiar forms of matter and force are concerned. What as yet unknown forms of matter and what still undiscovered forces and energies affect it or are affected by it, no one can say. Possibly there may be none; very possibly there may be many. We certainly do not yet know what are the exact compositions of some of the organic compounds pro-

duced in the body for special uses, as, for example, the fatty substances of low-temperature combustion which are employed by the fire-fly and glow-worm in the production of light without heat, or the unstable composition of nerve-cells and of the gymnotus' voltaic battery. We have no positive clue to the nature of that mysterious force which flexes the muscles, bends a finger, moves a limb, or keeps the whole automatic system in operation for threescore years and ten, still less of the method of telegraphy which directs it or of the even more mysterious mental and intellectual forces and powers back of all and hidden in the most inaccessible recesses of the complicated mechanism within which we "live and move and have our being."

The anatomical structure of this singular machine is well understood, and the surgeon can do wonderful work in its dissection, its repair and reconstruction; but of its mainspring and its moving forces we are hardly more perfectly informed than were our barbarous ancestors of the days of the Greek and Roman civilization, or even of the time of Homer and the prehistoric ages. From the point of view of the mechanician, this machine—marvellous as it is as a study in anatomy, or to the investigator in physiology, in psychology, or in physics and chemistry—is strange and crude. It has not a revolving wheel or shaft, a cam or a gear, a belt or a piston, or a rigid system of mechanical "pairing," in the whole complicated and wonderful construction. Its operations, so far as mechanical, are all carried on by systems of levers, jointed in curious ways, and worked by cords of elastic muscle. Its mechanical operations and movements are all simple and easily traced and understood; but the forces and energies transferred and transformed are as mysterious in nature and method of action as their resultant effects in producing motion are simple. Some force—no one knows precisely what—and some energy, equally unidentified, cause contraction and relaxation of muscles and transformation of the unknown form of energy into mechanical power and muscular force and work. Where this energy of primary form is originated, what is its course, and how it affects the muscle, no one can say. Whether produced by chemical action in the assimilative organs, at which limit we lose sight of the material fed into the machine as the storehouse of the potential energy ultimately thus applied, whether given form in the capillaries and the lungs, where it

flows as venous blood and is transformed into arterial; whether created in some special organ of the system, in gland or nerve, or spine and brain, or whether arising through transformation in the muscle itself at the instant it is required for its work, no one can yet positively say. No man can assert that this energy is thermal, electrical, chemical, physical, or whether it is some as yet unfamiliar and, to the biologist, novel and peculiar form of energy which has escaped the hands and eluded the view of the man of science, learned in chemistry and physics and in all the transformations of exterior energetics.

What we do know of the complicated and puzzling sphinx is this.

Oxidizable substances, always vegetable in origin directly, as the fruits and grains, or indirectly, as the flesh-foods, are taken into the furnace, as some suppose, into the alembic, or whatever the stomach may be considered, and are there subjected to a chemical process of solution, with chemical transformation into compounds capable of absorption by the fluids of the system. They are then, with suitable further treatment, such as the emulsification of the fatty matters, taken into the circulation, and become a part of the blood. Continuous circulation between the heart and the various organs of the body and through the capillary system, and into and out of the lungs, alternately charges this vital fluid with deoxidized and carbonized substances and oxidizes them, throwing off the resultant carbon-dioxide, carbonic acid as it is more familiarly called, into the surrounding atmosphere. It is known that only a fraction, in rare cases not one-fourth, of all the food supplied is utilized to the extent of absorption into the circulation. It is now perfectly well known what is the nature and the quantity of the chemical compounds rejected by the animal machine in its working condition, as well as what are the constituents of the always combustible materials furnished it; but no one yet knows just how these materials, as reconstructed and absorbed into the circulating fluid, are made to produce energy, or what the energy unquestionably produced in large quantities, which are approximately measurable, is like, or how that or any other energy that may also exist in the system is stored, transferred from point to point, or transformed and utilized as mechanical or other power. At the end of the nineteenth century it is not yet ascertained whether heat, electricity, a vital

energy of as yet undetermined character and method of operation, nerve and brain power, mental force as a distinct energy, or what other, if there be any other, energies are the intermediary between the potential energy of the food and the applied energy of muscle, nerve, brain, chemical forces of digestion and nutrition, automatic powers of vitality, and mental and bodily action. With the entrance of the prepared nutriment into the system, all traces and clues of the mystery are lost, and the most learned man of to-day is as ignorant of the nature and action of the vital and other processes that preserve, repair, and operate this most intricate and curious of machines as the most ignorant savage. We can eliminate some current hypotheses, and to that extent approach the real source of life and action, and may possibly obtain some hint of the nature of these concealed forces ; but the problem remains still one of the most attractive, tantalizing, and important of all the unsolved mysteries of science.

We know that peptonized and otherwise prepared food, always of vegetable origin and in oxidizable form, in that sense combustible, passes into the vital machine, and that a large fraction is rejected unutilized, together with considerable volumes of products of combustion leaving by way of the lungs, as exhalations of unknown amount by way of the skin. Large quantities of energy, in the form of heat, are carried out of the system and conducted and radiated from the skin. All the work of the muscles, whether performed upon external objects, in the movements of the body, as in walking and in the labor of the hands, or applied to the automatic processes which are essential to life, as digestion, circulation, and breathing, or to those which simply characterize animal life, as perception, observation, and thought, is also rejected energy. No energy is, or can be, destroyed in the vital or any other system, and all that enters is balanced by a corresponding quantity leaving it. Probably substantially all the internal, automatic work of the living machine is performed in respiration and the circulation of the fluids of the body through their miles of narrow channel and capillary ducts. This is work of friction, and all of it must be reconverted into heat ; it constitutes a large part, if not the whole,* of the heat thrown out of the system.

The lungs reject compounds familiar in common life as pro-

* Rubner confirms this anticipation by his experimental researches.

ducts of combustion. But the temperature of the animal system is necessarily lower than the boiling-point of water throughout, and usually less than 100 degrees Fahrenheit, often falling to nearly the atmospheric temperature, or, in the case of fishes, to that of the water in which they live. This combustion or oxidation must take place at a temperature thus limited, and must consequently be an entirely different process from that familiar to us in the furnaces of the "heat-engines." It is more like that seen in the rusting of iron, the decay of wood or the processes of the chemist's laboratory. But, curiously enough, the breaking up of organic substances by the processes of non-vital natural decay is known to result largely, if not mainly, from the action of microbic parasites, and this fact is one of the evidences against the once usual theory that the animal machine is a heat-engine and its thermal product that of its furnace. That chemical affinities originate all energies of the vital system is undoubted; but all intermediate steps between the introduction of its potential energy into the body and the development of the transformed equivalent in dynamic and thermal energy are as yet concealed from us.

The question whether the animal machine is a heat-engine characterized by singularly low-temperature combustion, as formerly assumed, is promptly settled, and beyond dispute, by the fact that the whole system is of substantially uniform temperature. In all known heat-engines, the conversion of thermal into mechanical energy is consequent upon variations of pressure and volume of working fluids within a range of temperature, the extent of which limits the proportion of heat which may be thus utilized. The narrower this range, the less is the work performed and the smaller the proportion of the heat supplied which is transformable into dynamic energy and work. In the best modern steam-engines, this range is, at best, not above one-fourth the whole scale measured from the temperature of the steam down to the absolute zero at which all heat-motion ceases, and only this proportion could be utilized, at best, in a perfect machine. The proportion is higher in gas engines; but the wastes are more than proportionally greater in the engine as actually operated, and the two forms of heat-engine are practically to-day about equal. In the animal machine this range is very nearly zero; all parts of the fluid mass and contained solids

being, in the human body for example, held at about ninety-eight degrees Fahrenheit. The animal machine therefore cannot produce thermo-dynamic transformations, unless by some as yet undiscovered process which entirely evades the well-established laws of thermo-dynamics as applied to the heat-engines familiar to us. To produce such effects it will be necessary to carry parts of the system through a range of temperature equal to that of the steam-engine, if the known efficiency of the machine is to be secured in that manner. This is obviously an impossibility.

The deduction follows that the animal machine is not a heat-motor, or a thermo-dynamic engine, which deduction may be accepted as very nearly, if not absolutely, certain. The consequent conclusion thus follows that it is an engine operated thermo-electrically or by some other less familiar, very possibly entirely unknown, process of energy-transformation.

Many distinguished men of science have been attracted by these riddles of the vital machine, and have tried to read its oracles; but with little success as yet. Joule, as early as 1843, called attention to the fact that the machine must be one for transformation of energy, and found that the result should be a lower proportional development of heat, for a given volume of product of oxidation exhaled, when at work than when at rest. This conclusion was experimentally confirmed by Hirn, in 1858, by actually confining men and and women and youth in hermetically sealed chambers, into and out of which air could be introduced, and the contaminated atmosphere discharged, only through ducts so arranged that he might readily and accurately measure their volume and analytically determine their constituents. He found that the heat, the work, the volume of carbonized gases, had those general relations of quantity which had been predicted by Joule as a consequence of the then newly accepted laws of energy-transformation. The larger the amount of energy applied to external work, the less the quantity of energy rejected in other forms. The human machine and motor obeys the laws of energy as precisely as does the steam or the gas engine; although this fact is not a proof that it is a heat-engine, but simply indicates that it is a transformer of energy by processes the nature of which we have not yet ascertained. Similarly, the dynamo-electric machine in this sense complies with the laws of energetics

and yet is unrestricted by any law limiting its efficiency such as fetters the heat-engines.

Messrs. Becquerel and Breschet and later investigators have found, by actually introducing slender, needle-like thermometers into the flesh, that the temperature of the body is substantially the same in all parts. The muscles are one or two degrees higher in temperature than the skin tissue, and, during exercise, they may rise a degree or two higher still; but there is no point in the body, so far as can be ascertained, at which the heat exceeds the mean to any important extent. Hirn and others have shown that the human machine has at least the efficiency of the best steam engines; that is to say, it converts as large a proportion of its supply of energy into work as the best heat-engines. This would, were it a heat-engine, a thermo-dynamic machine of similar character, compel the provision of steam-boiler temperatures within the body—a simple impossibility in a mass composed mainly of fluids evaporating at the boiling-point under atmospheric pressure and of tissues altered by temperatures not greatly in excess of that standard. Experiment also shows the arterial blood to be but two or three degrees, at most, above the temperature of the venous; cold-blooded animals, as the fishes, usually exhibit no greater excess of heat over the fluid in which they live, and the molluscs practically coincide in temperature with the water about them. Exercise, increasing the temperature of all living mechanisms, notwithstanding the increased amount of energy drawn from the store and converted into work, raises the temperature of the whole machine and causes large increase in the quantity of heat conducted, radiated, and exhaled; but this very possibly comes mainly of the increased heart action, accelerating the flow of the currents in the arteries and veins and the conversion of its friction-work into heat. The fact gives no clue to the secrets of the vital sphinx.

Galvani showed that the nerves could be traversed and the muscles contracted by a current of voltaic or of high-tension electricity, and many later investigators confirmed his statements, while still others have shown that currents actually traverse the muscular and nerve tissues which originate in the body, and which, reversing Galvani's experiment, reveal their nature by all the tests familiar to the physicist as detecting the presence and measuring the action of electric currents from artificial sources.

The potentialities of the animal machine are developed in this direction most strikingly in the gymnotus and many other creatures, in which the currents are produced in great power and intensity, and directed, at will, in the capture of their prey or in self-defence, sometimes disabling a man or felling an ox by their powerful discharges. The fact of the transformation of energy is well illustrated in these cases by the exhaustion of the creature when it has continued this discharge of electrical energy a short time. To this extent, certainly, these animals are electro-dynamic machines. The electric eel and the torpedo are but the two best known of about fifty such electro-dynamic animal machines already discovered, and it is thought by some authorities that all animals possess this power of producing and applying electric energy in less degree. Faraday found that the gymnotus, the electric eel, has a storage power equal to that of fifteen large Leyden jars. It is probably well-established that every muscle and nerve of every animal is traversed by energy closely related to the electric current, and Daguin calls this "*l' électricité vitale.*"

Perhaps the most beautiful and striking of all the potentialities of the animal machine is that exhibited by those in which energy, whatever its nature, developed and stored in the body, or applied in its various curious and intricate operations, is made to take the form of light. In all the practical work of the engineer and of the man of science, light is only obtainable by the production of high temperatures, and the brighter the light the higher must be the temperature of its source. At 700 degrees to 800 degrees Fahrenheit a red glow only appears; at 1,000 degrees almost white light is produced; at 1,500 degrees to 2,000 degrees the radiance becomes brilliant, and the dazzling lights of the electric arc and of the sun indicate temperatures measured by thousands of degrees. Yet, on the other hand, we find light produced in nature without perceptible heat. Moonlight is sunlight almost freed from heat; its warmth is not only insensible, but so feeble that it is only by Professor Langley's famous "bolometer," an instrument of unimaginable delicacy, that science can measure it at all. The phosphorescence of the decaying stump or fallen tree in the forest, and that of the animalculæ with which the waters of tropical seas so frequently teem, are examples of the production of light without heat, and, in the case of the latter at

all events, at very nearly the temperature of the animal organism and of the surrounding sea.

The glow-worm and the firefly are provided with apparatus especially designed by nature for the production of this low-temperature light, free from heat, and Professor Langley and his colleague, Mr. Very, have shown by bolometric tests that this light from the animal machine is comparable only with moonlight in its freedom from heat. In other and, for our present purposes, much more significant, words, the vital machine converts energy into pure light without wasting it in the form of heat. In the familiar forms of artificial light, the heat, which is not only wasted and thrown away, but is a source of great annoyance and a real evil in many ways, constitutes an enormous proportion, often ninety-nine per cent., of the energy expended, and a proportional part of its cost is thus thrown away with it. We pay one or five per cent. of our bills for the light received, the balance for the heat wasted; very much as, in the heat-engines, we pay often a similar proportion for power received and a balance of equal proportionate amount for the heat thrown away unutilized; one or five cents in every dollar paying for value received, ninety-five or ninety-nine cents being paid for wasted, yet no less costly, energy. Gas and bright oil-flames, electric glow and arc lamps, respectively, return us one, two, and ten per cent. of the energy transmitted to them for transformation into light; while the moon and the glow-worm or firefly give us light without sensible heat. The animal as a light-producing machine is thus many times more efficient than the apparatus of the electrical engineer; it seems possible that we may find this vital mechanism but little less economical as a motive machine, and serving as a guide to the construction of artificial apparatus that shall displace the heat-engines and utilize the enormous proportion of their energy-supply now wasted.

Scientific investigation, on the other hand, has discovered facts which decidedly conflict with our theories of thermo-electric and electro-dynamic transformations of energies in the vital machine. The velocity of the nerve impulses is but about 90 feet per second in cold-blooded, and two to three times that speed in warm-blooded, animals; while electric currents are ordinarily inconceivably more rapid; thus indicating peculiar conditions of electrical conduction, if this be the mode of communication along

the nerve, or, perhaps more probably, something like a mechanical or a wave-like transmission, molecule acting by contact with molecule, as often observed in muscular movements. The originating form of energy and method of energy-conversion in the brain and spinal cord remain, in any event, as obscure as ever. It is found, also, that light and heat may be produced, and sometimes are produced, by the combustion in the animal system of certain fatty fuels capable of oxidation at these low temperatures, with liberation of heat and light at the same low intensity, thus safely burning without danger to the tissues. The probability that this may be a customary method of production of heat in the animal machine is thus indicated, and the mystery in such case is that of nature's method of producing such fuels from foods and of conducting their combustion.

Summarizing the argument: the animal machine, the vital prime motor in which we live, is supplied daily with an amount of energy in its food equivalent, dynamically, to the potential energy of a pound of coal. This is, in turn, the equivalent of one-fifth of a horse-power for twenty-four hours. A day's work is at most one-eighth of a horse-power for one-third of a day, at steady labor, one twenty-fourth as an average for the twenty-four hours. Thus measured by the labor of a working man, the animal machine utilizes one-fifth of the energy supplied it, just the efficiency of the best steam engines that the greatest inventors and best mechanics of our time have been able to produce. But it does much more than this. The brain takes from one-fifth to one-tenth of the original stock of energy; all the work of digestion, respiration, and circulation, and of every muscular movement, voluntary and involuntary, and all that of reconstructing and repairing tissue of muscle and nerve and bone, must be added, and the efficiency of this prime mover is thus very far in excess of twenty per cent. and of the performance of the best engines. The experiments of Hirn, showing the rejected heat-energy to be twice as great, proportionally to oxygen inhaled, when at rest as when at work, indicates the total efficiency to be about fifty per cent. or two and a half times as great as in the best engines of human construction; the production of power being the gauge. Langley has shown that, where the animal machine produces light, it does so at a cost, substantially all heat being eliminated, of probably a small fraction of one per cent.

of that of our familiar lights; and other investigations show that, where adapted to the production of electricity of high tension, as in the gymnotus, it does this by consuming food—combustibles composed of the same elements, mainly, as our fuels —and, by this direct evolution, escapes the loss of nine-tenths or ninety-five hundredths of the energy drawn upon in our artificial methods of electric light and power generation. Heat production must be similarly economical in the animal machine, as there are no important losses from it, it produces just enough to keep its temperature normal and constant under its covering of non-conducting hair or wool. In all these vital operations, heat and power are always produced and observable. Indications of the generation and use of electricity or some similar energy are detected in all animal machines, and sometimes electricity, also, in large quantity and of high intensity. In some instances the production of light is a result of transformation of energy in these machines, and thus the animal system illustrates the transformation of energies in all known ways, exhibits direct transformations unknown in applied science and engineering, and excels always, and sometimes enormously, in the efficiency with which it effects these transformations and performs its special tasks.

Could the inventor, the man of science, the engineer, compete with nature in these directions, it is evident that the stores of fuel, now so rapidly wasting before the growing demands of civilized races, would last many times longer than now appears probable; the period when the race must bore into the interior of the earth or remove to the tropics to obtain heat and power would be proportionally delayed. A day's work or a dollar would become equal in value to a large multiple of the value to-day measured in heat, light, electricity, or mechanical power, and the human race would be enriched and advantaged inconceivably through the discoveries of science and the ingenuity of the inventor, the mechanic, the engineer. That such outcome of the labors of scientific men is certain, no one can say; that it is probable, no one will deny; that it is possible, every one will admit. The future undoubtedly will display more and greater wonders as the fruit of intelligent scientific investigation, than has the past, than has even the generation just past. Among these marvels, it is safe to predict, will come at least some approximation to nature's methods of production of all the energies.

Whatever may ultimately prove to be the facts of physical, chemical, dynamic, energy-conversion, by the physiological processes of the vital organism, it is unquestionable that their study is imperative; and the reading of the riddles of this living sphinx constitutes a standing challenge to the man of science and the engineer; for within these mysteries are hidden the secrets of mightier powers than have yet been, in the remotest degree, approximated by man. Once these economies are attained by the engineer, in artificial heat, light, and power production, he will have insured proportional increase in the life of the race and in the sum of human comfort and happiness, and will have led in the elevation of the whole social system to an inconceivably higher level.

R. H. THURSTON.

THE PLAIN TRUTH ABOUT ASIATIC LABOR.

BY THE HON. JOHN BARRETT, UNITED STATES MINISTER TO SIAM.

THAT the world demands the truth—devoid of romance and speculation—about Asiatic labor and competition is evident, if the press of America and Europe reflect public interest.

This is natural. Here is a question that may concern everyone. The possibilities of Asiatic labor as a competitor may involve not only the commercial and economic, but the social, development of all nations. Labor is a vital portion of society's organism. Any derangement of the former immediately affects the latter.

To be more specific, we are brought face to face with the staggering question: What influence will the millions of continental Asia exert in shaping material and moral history, if they soften their rigidity of character and become a malleable and adaptive force like the Japanese; if they evolve from a heterogeneous into a homogeneous factor in production, and learn to be expert producers and competitors as well as extensive consumers?

It is a matter of breadwinning. It implies a fiercer struggle for existence. It suggests another application of the stern principle of the survival of the fittest.

I am not an alarmist. I prefer sense to sensation. These prefatory statements are simply plain terms intended to attest the importance of the subject. I will even admit that from data at hand, covering several years' observation and study, I am inclined to be more optimistic than pessimistic in my view of the future, but this discussion shall not be prejudiced by my hopes.

In telling the truth of the situation there can be no better beginning than the exposing of untruths. I refer to the grossly exaggerated and most injurious reports that have appeared in leading American papers and have been copied without limit over the land. Before me now are several illustrations.

The bicycle and button stories are the worst offenders. Originating as usual in interviews with alleged authorities, they were copied and commented upon from San Francisco to New York. They were discussed in a hundred Chambers of Commerce. They were the subject of congressional debate. They stated that Japanese bicycles would soon be sold in the United States as low as twelve dollars, gold, and that cheap Japanese buttons were flooding our markets at such prices that competition was absolutely hopeless. What are the facts? First, there is no bicycle factory in Japan that has yet turned out a wheel that an American buyer would even look at, much less ride, for less than fifty dollars, gold; second, there is no plant that can turn out over 150 wheels in a year; third, Japan cannot yet successfully compete against the cheap buttons of Austria and Germany in her own markets, and imports large quantities; fourth, neither consular invoices nor Custom-House records show any importations at the valuations claimed of buttons into the United States either then or recently, or is there any establishment in Japan which can produce them at those rates.

These two instances are the more important of many. To those who are skeptical I say: Do not believe these wonderful reports until they are verified in the official government returns of imports, which any one can obtain.

By exposing these fallacies I do not wish to be understood as anticipating my other conclusions. My only purpose is to correct impressions which are absolutely unwarranted—impressions that have been too generally accepted. Were they true, I would not only admit them, but strive to analyze them and describe the labor itself.

What are the facts of Asiatic capability and what may give us cause of apprehension and arouse fear of severe competition will be presently discussed.

Having cleared our vision of some hazy conceptions, we can now consider well-defined operations. Although Japan has so far completely distanced China in her manufacturing strides, the latter presents, perhaps, the most interesting field. In studying China's efforts, there is the ever-present thought that these numberless millions may become a powerful manufacturing people. Despite the conservative spirit that rules supreme from Canton to Peking, despite the fact that we cannot record

for China such wonderful achievements as those of Japan in the last decade, we can recapitulate resources and opportunities unlimited, and pause to consider what will come if she starts on a similar line, either alone or under guidance. Great bodies may move slowly, but the avalanche and tidal wave show that they can move rapidly and irresistibly. China to-day is the greatest riddle of all nations. No statesman, no diplomat, no philosopher, no historian, dares prophesy with full certainty as to her future. It is useless, therefore, for me to speculate on what she may do as a manufacturing land, but I can describe the actual conditions of the present. From them each person can draw his own conclusion.

Shanghai and Hankow are the only two points in China proper where large modern manufacturing plants are established and in operation. These cities are respectively the New York and Chicago of China. Shanghai is the gateway to the great, rich Yang-tse-Kiang Valley. It is growing with the rapidity of some of our Western cities. Its foreign section would do credit to a prosperous home port, with its imposing buildings and well-kept streets. For a manufacturing center its location is unsurpassed. There are miles and miles of deep-water frontage. The largest steamers and ships are constantly leaving for all parts of the world. Coasting steamers touch at every port in China, Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Java, and Siam. River craft equal to those of the Hudson and Mississippi run regularly 600 miles up the Yang-tse to Hankow, and connect with smaller vessels that go 400 miles beyond, to Ichang, which in turn connect with junks that proceed 400 miles further, to the new treaty port of Chunking, where the United States have recently established a consulate.

I give this much attention to Shanghai because not only is it the leading port of the Far East—not counting Hong Kong and Singapore, which are British colonies—but, in the opinion of the best informed authorities, it will become the great central manufacturing point of the Pacific seas, even surpassing ultimately Osaka in Japan. As evidence of its present business and of the reasonableness of this prophecy, it is well to remember that nearly 3,000 merchant steamers cleared from the port of Shanghai in 1894.

Hankow, as intimated above, occupies a position in China so

similar to that of Chicago in America, that it must become the chief distributing and manufacturing point of interior China. It already is the principal tea-centre, and it has a foreign section whose extent and condition attest the importance of the city.

The number and size of modern manufactories in Shanghai will surprise those who have not studied this question nor personally investigated the plants. As one passes by or through them he could easily imagine himself in Fall River or Manchester, were it not for the laborer himself, *who, in his wage price, is the very secret of their success.* There are six large cotton-spinning mills with 125,000 spindles either working or about ready for operation. There are eight cotton-ginning plants, with thirty-two to seventy-two gins each, most of which are running. Twenty steam silk filatures are operated, with a reeling capacity of 24,000 bales per annum. A paper mill, which would be a credit to Holyoke or Oregon City, is doing a large business.

Are they making money, and are they competing with the goods formerly supplied entirely by import? The most convincing answer is that, in addition to six cotton mills running or about ready, three new companies, controlled by foreign capital, one of which, I am glad to say, is reported to be American, have been organized. The capital stock, averaging from $500,000 to $750,000, gold, was promptly subscribed, showing the confidence of investors in the opportunity. Consul-General Jernigan, in a careful report* on this subject, says:

"The larger mill will be under the general management of a well-known American firm†, and in the prospectus an estimate of the expenditure on capital account of a cotton mill of 40,000 spindles is presented: The cost of the machinery for the plant is estimated at 500,000 ‡taels [$380,500, gold], the land improvement at 40,000 taels [$30,440, gold], preliminary expenses and contingencies at 10,000 taels [$7,610, gold]. The ready value of the output of such a mill, working three hundred days, with a proper deduction for brokerage, is estimated at 1,611,900 taels [$1,226,655, gold]. The expenditure, including raw material, cost of working, duty (if any is incurred), expense of management and depreciation in machinery and building, is estimated at 1,475,630 taels [$1,122,954, gold], leaving a balance available for dividends of, say, 17 per cent. on 800,000 taels [$608,800, gold]. The dividend anticipated from the expense and profit account thus stated is based upon other consid-

* See page 355, Consular Reports, November, 1895.

† Whether this American company has actually begun operations I am unable to positively state at this writing, but four new companies have been successfully floated with foreign capital, and several of their mills are in course of construction. —J. B.

‡ Tien-Tsin taels = 76.1 cents U. S. currency at time of Consular report.

erations. In one prospectus, it is argued that experiments, made and verified by the experience of existing local mills, show that locally produced yarns are superior to Indian [Bombay] yarns, in which so great a trade has, in recent years, been established; and there is no reason why such yarns should continue to be imported when similar yarns can be manufactured at Shanghai, and of a superior grade."

A cardinal point to remember, in studying the possibilities of this competition, is the readiness of native Chinese capital to embark in these schemes. Nearly all the mills now running belong to Chinese. Capital from the north and south and interior is pouring into Shanghai for similar investment. It is erroneous to suppose that the individual Chinese capitalist is stubbornly conservative. It is the government, the great official system, that stands like a stone wall in the way of the Westerner; and yet I cannot accept the sweeping assertion that the Chinese government is unalterably opposed to foreign innovations. On my last visit to China I saw many unmistakable signs to the contrary.

But the labor itself is the chief feature of this industrial renaissance. The highest wage that I discovered paid in the Shanghai cotton mills to a native male employee was 50 cents, silver (26½ cents gold), per day, the lowest 12 cents, silver (6½ cents gold), while the average was about 20 to 34 cents, silver (10½ to 18 cents gold). None of these sums included food. The wage of 50 cents per day was not paid to more than 10 men in 1,000. The wage of 12 cents per day was paid to coolies who did the unskilled common work about the factories. Where women were employed, they received even less than the men, or from 5 to 20 cents, silver. In some establishments wages depended on the "piece" scale. The employees generally had a healthy, vigorous look, as if life had no great cares. They were cheerful and, in most instances, attentive to work. The more skilled would glance at me as if to say: "You foreigners may have made these machines, but we can show you how to run them!"

The observer is especially impressed as he watches these thousands of Chinese laborers going in and out of these mills at shifting hours. Nothing that human beings do more resembles the action of bees in a hive. Then, again, they seem like part of a great stream that has no beginning and no ending, flowing from one sea to another—coming as they do from a reserve of countless millions. One doubts if a strike could ever succeed with hungry thousands to draw from for every one that goes out.

Face to face with the problem, you think, you argue, you calculate, you imagine whether the wages of these men will ever be high enough to remove that omnipresent spectre of "cheap Asiatic labor." At one moment you have the question all carefully settled on theories of skilled labor becoming scarce, of new associated conditions of life, of higher cost of living, of labor organizations and strikes, of this and that change in society; the next moment you despair of a solution, as you ponder on those same unending millions, on the cheap vegetable diet, which, even in foreign lands, the Chinese does not forsake, on his capacity to save money from pay that would not supply a meager portion of an American laborer's absolute necessities, and on the supreme lack of ambition among the masses, whose plodding nature, it would seem, all the electricity in the world could not cause to experience the slightest twinge.

Perhaps the most interesting labor experiment—I say experiment advisedly—in China, I found in Wuchang, the capital of Hupeh Province, in the heart of China, the home of the celebrated Viceroy Chang Chih Tung, and opposite Hankow, on the Yangtse. Here is an immense establishment controlled by the Viceroy, employing 3,500 hands, running 40,000 spindles. It occupies four large buildings, with two more in course of construction, lighted by electricity and heated by steam, constructed of pressed brick, with corrugated-iron roofs, provided with machinery of the latest design, and powerful engines. The dimensions of the two largest structures were respectively 510 by 327 feet, and 528 by 406 feet. This is the splendid equipment of cotton mills in the interior of a land which most Americans think is the home of only primitive industry—an equipment of which the richest cotton-mill owners of England or New England could be proud.

Employees in such a factory in Massachusetts would earn $1.25 to $4, gold, per day. Employees in this factory in Hankow or Wuchang, to the number of 3,500, receive on an average 150 *cash, or* 15 *cents, silver, per day; that is, only* 8 *cents, gold!* And the Viceroy was thinking of reducing the wages because the mills were not profitable! The manager, an Englishman, stated that they did not pay. Another authority said this was because the Viceroy, for political reasons, did not want them to pay. That is why I call the mills an experiment—the Viceroy has not

yet decided whether he wishes them to prosper or not. Here, again, the laborers appeared faithful, contented, and attentive. Few requests were made for increase of wages, but if a man was so rash he was immediately replaced by one of the city's 800,000 outside. The manager made a declaration that should be considered: one American hand will tend six looms while a Chinese will tend only one. On that basis, multiply eight cents, gold, by six, and we have a daily wage of only forty-eight cents. Little consolation there!

The output of Chinese mills is chiefly yarn; but some serges, twills, drills, and brocades are manufactured. None of the latter varieties can compare favorably yet with the common American and British products. The yarn is not equal to that imported from Great Britain, but it is often superior to that of India. There are usually a few foreigners employed at high salaries in charge of the mills, but they will be gradually replaced by natives in the native-owned plants. I used to be of the opinion that the greater portion of the raw cotton must come from America, but, as I went up and down the Yang-tse-Kiang valley and saw its limitless capabilities for cotton production, I was forced in a measure to change my opinion. The American cotton is superior to the Chinese cotton, however, and prominent manufacturers assured me that, were the Nicaragua Canal constructed, there would be a large permanent import into China from New Orleans and other Gulf ports, and especially into Japan, in far greater quantities than now.

As illustrating the fact that labor and manufacturing are becoming diversified in China, note should be taken of the immense sugar refineries of Hong Kong, second only in size and output to those of the Sugar Trust in America, where several thousand Chinese are employed at less than 35 cents, silver, each, per day, and supplying the Oriental market; of the great docks at Hong Kong, where hundreds of skilled mechanics work for less than 40 cents, silver, per day, and repair vessels more cheaply than can be done in America and Europe; of the extensive modern iron works and arsenals at Shanghai and Hanyang (near Hankow), where over 4,000 men, when there is work to be done, labor at an average of 20 cents, silver, per day.

All of these mean competition. That is axiomatic. What can be made in China will not be imported. It is at present,

however competition limited to its surroundings. It is defensive, not offensive, competition. If it succeeds in defensive tactics, as it were, will it succeed in offensive? If it can do so much at home, will it invade foreign fields? These questions I am not expected in this article to discuss. Perhaps the advocates respectively of protection and free trade can argue the issue and solve the riddle.

In this paper I give as much attention to China as to Japan. I believe that danger, if danger there is or is to be, lies in China far more than in Japan. This may be contrary to common opinion, but thorough investigation on the ground convinces me that it is true. To-day for the same work wages are higher in Japan than in China. The supply of labor in Japan is more limited now and always will be. Wages in Japan have a strong tendency to advance; in China they have not. Living is cheaper in China than in Japan. The Japanese are more ambitious than the Chinese and less satisfied with small pay. Raw material of most varieties is cheaper in China and nearer at hand than in Japan; while in the practical application of the principles of both demand and supply China has the advantage of Japan.

A few doubts as to China's policy removed, a few political clouds cleared away, a few more concessions and rights granted to foreigners, and we may witness an industrial development in China that will equal and surpass that of Japan. Capital will be ready, and it will not confine itself to the present narrow limits.

Japan in July boasted of sixty-five cotton-mills with approximately one million spindles. In 1893 there were forty; in 1890, thirty; in 1888, twenty. Osaka is the central point, and it presents a most modern business-like appearance, with its large factories and lofty chimneys. Aside from cotton-mills, there are many other industries, of which the most interesting are the new watch and brush factories. From a personal inspection of the leading manufactories, and careful inquiry of the owners and managers, I learned the following facts: The highest wages paid to native employees in the cotton-mills are seventy-five cents, silver, per day, the lowest five cents (female labor); the average twenty-five cents for fairly-skilled male labor and eighteen cents for similar female labor. Large numbers of women and children earn only five to ten cents. In the brush-mak-

ing establishment I counted one hundred women who were earning at piecework only seven cents per day, and yet they worked long hours. The watch and clock factory is not a large establishment and the wages are higher. Some employees received as much as a dollar, while the majority earned about forty cents. In a dozen miscellaneous industrial plants other than those named, wages ranged from fifteen cents to eighty cents, with an average of thirty-five cents. In Kobe's celebrated match factories several hundred women and children were working with extraordinary despatch and skill and earning by piecework only five cents a day.

The average number of hands employed in the six leading Osaka cotton mills is 820 women and 390 men, a total of 1,200. The women outnumber the men in the majority of mills two and a half to one, and four to one in a few. In the great Kanegafuchi plant, at Tokyo, the women outnumber the men four to one. In this establishment the wages of the women were about half that of the men. In the Osaka Company, at Osaka, which has a capital of 1,200,000 yen and 37.513 spindles, there are employed 600 men besides women, and the wages of the former are one-third more than those of the latter. At Miye the female employees numbered 1,700 and the male 625. This may be a feature of Japanese labor that will have a vital bearing on the future. Many employers informed me that, besides being cheaper, the women gave less trouble, were more faithful, and quicker.

Eight representative establishments at Osaka have a total capitalization of 4,580,000 yen ($2,427,400, gold), run 162,000 spindles, employ 10,000 hands, work in shifts twenty-two of the twenty-four hours for 320 days of the year, and sell the yarn at an average price of 80 yen for 48 kwan (400 pounds), or 10 cents, gold, per pound.* These same companies paid handsome dividends last year, the lowest being eight per cent. and the highest 26 per cent.

It is not true that the watch and clock factories of Japan are making goods cheaper than those of similar quality in America. They can control their own market in cheap clocks, but they cannot export at a profit. In watches they cannot yet compete successfully in both cheapness and quality with those imported

* One kwan equals about 8⅓ pounds avoirdupois.

from Switzerland and America. The brush plant in Osaka, however, is finding its great and exclusive market in the United States. New York buys nearly all of the output, and the demand keeps five hundred hands busy at average wages of twenty cents, silver, per day. This company shipped tooth, hair, and nail brushes, valued at $18,000, gold, to the United States in the last three months of 1895.

Some miscellaneous wages in and about Yokohama which I authenticated are as follows, in gold: Carpenters, 25 to 50 cents per day; compositors, 25 to 45 cents; tailors, 25 to 65 cents; plasterers, 26 to 40 cents; tea workers, 30 to 40 cents; farm laborers, $1.50 to $3 per month; personal household servants for foreigners, $8 to $10 per month—all of which are a great advance over two years ago; and they bid fair to go 50 to 100 per cent. higher in the next two years. Labor and wages in the silk, lacquer, porcelain, screen, matting, tea, curio, and other industries, which have always been characteristic of the country, I do not discuss beyond noting that the work is chiefly done by piece, not in great factories, but in private houses. So true is this of Japan, that the entire land might be regarded as one vast workshop with infinite subdivisions.

Before concluding this discussion it is necessary, in order to answer questions that are being continually asked concerning Asiatic labor, to note a few other general and specific features.

First. As to the measure of present and future Japanese competition with American products, the quarterly and annual returns of exports to the United States show that it has not yet reached an alarming stage, and our trade with Trans-Pacific lands has never yet attained such proportions as to be materially affected. The only imports similar to American products, such as brushes of all kinds, matches, carpets, rugs, paper, umbrellas, cotton piece goods, did not amount to over $100,000, gold, in the last quarter of 1895. Silk imports for the same period were approximately $3,500,000, gold, of which silk goods proper were only about $450,000. Matting was valued at $700,000, gold. Future competition depends so much on labor conditions, the development of commercial exchange, and the laws of demand and supply, that I cannot agree with those who declare we have nothing to fear any more than with those who predict the ruinous effects of Japanese competition.

Second. The advance of cost of labor in Japan is marked.* The last twelve months have witnessed a greater rise than that of the preceding twelve years. The war, the enlargement of both army and navy, and the general demand for all classes of labor growing out of the country's speedy development are chiefly responsible. Manufacturers will soon be compelled to face the results of their own competition. Every new establishment tends to increase wages. Skilled labor is not obtained in a day in Japan any more than in America.

Third. Labor is organizing, but no such organization exists as in America. The organization of employers is perfect, but that of employees is very imperfect. Extensive organization is so new that labor's conception of it is yet crude. There are signs that it is coming and that it will appreciate its power. Guilds of which we hear so much do not include, as a rule, the ordinary laborer, unless in house or piece work. Boycotting is a common agency employed in Japan. It is a thoroughly understood principle in both Japan and China, and is used with great power whenever occasion demands. The coolie riots and strikes in Hong Kong and the guild-directed boycotts of Yokohama attest this characteristic. Conditions of government and society in Japan are adverse to the popularity and utility of deliberate strikes. The laborers themselves are as well treated as in any land in the world, considering conditions of life, are not morose, seem satisfied, and hence do not take to perfected organization. They are satisfied with less ambitious schemes. The wages and surroundings, however, that give the Japanese laborer sufficiency and contentment would mean poverty and unhappiness for the American laborer. The cost of living for the masses in Japan is less than in any other important land, except China. As this is so influential a factor in the price of labor, it must be remembered in discussing the possibilities of cheap Asiatic labor. The cost of keeping a big, healthy laborer well fed does not exceed ten cents, silver, a day in Japan and five cents in China, and it probably averages much less.

Fourth. The same crowding into cities and the same tendency to give up former conditions of living and labor are noticeable in Japan as in America and Europe. Piece work in the little homes

* See recent reports of Minister Dun, Consul-General McIvor, and Consul Connolly.

is being abandoned for factories in cities. Who can announce with assurance that social problems are not to arise where 40,000,000 people suddenly find themselves transformed from a home-staying, piece-working, hand-making, and agricultural people to a restless, factory-filling, machinery-assisting, modern manufacturing people ?

Fifth. There is a "boom" on in Japan—a boom in floating and establishing numberless varieties of manufacturing plants from Nagasaki to Hakodate. This may lead to overproduction and financial disaster. Let us hope not, for the proud little kingdom deserves a better fate. But some of Japan's ablest business men acknowledge the boom and fear the consequences. Coming right after the war with China, it bears some resemblance to the remarkable American industrial development following the Civil War.

Sixth. The haste and effort to make large profits have resulted oftentimes in producing a poor quality of goods and the consequent loss of markets. The Japanese manufacturers, as a whole, have not yet learned to maintain a permanent high standard. It is claimed that they do not plan for the future. They think too much of the present. This is used as an argument against their competitive capability, and may prove valid if a change is not accomplished, but it would seem that time would remedy the defect.

Seventh. The Japanese and Chinese home demand is to-day different from that of America and Europe, and it may be some time before Japan and China can provide goods, especially for the foreign market, which can compete with the home supply of those foreign countries. The visitor to Yokohama is continually reminded, moreover, that he should buy his clothing there, especially shirts, because prices are apparently so much less than in San Francisco and New York. If the enterprising traveller will go to half the trouble in America to read the advertisements in local papers, he will find that he can obtain shirts of equal quality at the same or a less price. Perhaps a man can purchase a dress suit in Yokohama for twenty dollars, gold, but he will get a twenty-dollar fit, and the first evening he wears it at the club or theatre at home will be also the last one. Nor can a Japanese tailor make an American laboring man's suit for ten dollars, gold, that can equal in

wear what can be purchased for that sum in a hundred Chicago clothing stores. If large wholesale clothing manufacturing plants are established in the place of the present small back-rooms, it is possible that cheap clothing may be extensively exported.

Eighth. The Japanese government is taking one step which, perhaps, more than any other single influence, will enable her manufacturers to compete in foreign lands, and which exhibits an enterprise that the United States might emulate if it would revive its old marine and commercial supremacy; the subsidizing of steamship lines running to the Pacific Coast of the United States, Australia, and South America. In a few months the Nippon Yusen Kaisha will send its first steamer either to Puget Sound, Portland, or San Francisco.

Ninth. The effect of the new treaties will be closely watched. In two years more the old ones will be abrogated and foreign capital can establish its own industries wherever it pleases. What will be the direct effect on labor and competition it is difficult to outline beyond the fact that labor should advance, competition become more keen, and possibly also more attention will be given to the markets of Europe and America. I advise American capital to watch the field.

Tenth. I would not discourage American exporters from entering the Trans-Pacific field. There is a great opportunity, and it should be improved. If this paper suggests specific questions pertaining thereto, an answer may be found in the March number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, where I endeavored in plain terms to show that opportunity.

The eyes of the world are on the Far East. A coronation at Moscow, an invasion of the Soudan, a massacre in Armenia, a battle in Cuba, cannot hide the prevailing interest. Marshal Yamagata and Li Hung Chang were received everywhere in harmony with this sentiment. It is plain to be seen that the great issue of the Far East is not involved in the question what is the future of Korea or Siam, of Japan as a military power, of China's governmental possibilities, but what has the Western world to fear from the competitive labor of Asia's millions.

Some facts of the present are herein submitted.

Whatever policy the United States may see fit to follow, American interests in Trans-Pacific lands trust that it will be favorable to the upbuilding of the nation's commerce and trade.

JOHN BARRETT.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE TAXATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

MR. SPEED MOSBY in his article in the August number of THE REVIEW says: "The taxation of church property for governmental purposes would be most unwise and indiscreet."

The general theory of all just taxation is reciprocal service. Judge Cooley in his "*Law of Taxation*" says: "The protection of the government being the consideration for which taxes are demanded, all parties who receive, or are entitled to, that protection may be called upon to render the equivalent." It costs the community something to enjoy the use of property. If the church paid taxes it would pay its fair and honest share to secure its enjoyment of the use of property.

Church property is not exempt from taxation. The taxes have to be paid, and the property that is exempt, or rather omitted from the tax roll, is simply spread upon the other property. Everybody's tax goes up at least one-tenth. The American people would rise up in rebellion against direct taxation for church support, but what is exemption from taxation, but an indirect state support of the church, a virtual subsidy for its support, and at the expense of the general public? The state avoids a deficiency in its revenues by transferring to other property increased taxation, not by the voluntary action of the tax-payers, but by the compulsion of law, all of which is out of consonance with our republican institutions. The founders of our Republic wisely separated church and state. But if we are taxed for the support of churches it cannot justly be said that church and state are separated. Benjamin Franklin said: "When a religion is good, I conceive that it will support itself, and when it cannot support itself, and God does not take care to support it, so its professors are obliged to call for help from the civil power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one."

The churches enjoy no immunity from the operations of the laws of God. They place roofs upon their buildings to keep out the rain, and put up lightning rods to prevent lightning striking them. If God does not vary his laws for the benefit of churches, why should the state be expected to do so?

It is argued that many churches are not self-sustaining at present, and that to tax them would render them still less so. Thousands are less able to provide for their children because of the tax-collector. Why should the laborer pay taxes upon his humble home, and the religious corporation be exempted? Make all property bear its just and equal share of taxation and you lessen the laboring man's burden. When the workingman feels that his burden is heavier, because the magnificent possessions of the church are omitted from the tax roll, do you wonder that the church loses its power over him?

Tax churches and only those able to bear taxes will dare to be extravagant. Tax churches and modest buildings will be erected where they are most needed, instead of a few imposing structures in the fashionable quarter. Every tax-payer in the city, the county, and the state has his per centage of state tax correspondingly increased because of the needlessly expensive church properties of the cities, churches which he may never enter.

The church yields no income to the incorporators; neither do many other kinds of property. But the state cannot regulate its action by rule of income. The state may and does tax for local benefits; then why not also for general benefits?

The saloon-keeper by force of law is compelled to help pay the taxes on my church, in the use of which I denounce his infernal traffic. If the saloon-keeper is taxed to support my church, in all fairness he ought to have something to say in its management. "No taxation without representation."

In 1850, the church property of the United States, which paid no tax, municipal or state, amounted to $87,000,000. In 1860, the amount had doubled. In 1870, it was $365,483,587. The census of 1890 reported the alleged value of church edifices, the lots on which they stand, and their furnishings, as $680,687,106. This does not include parsonages, lots, monasteries, convents, schools, colleges, etc. A conservative estimate of the value of the church property of all sects in this country is $2,000,000,000. In 1875, President Grant, in his message to Congress on the subject of a total separation of church and state, and the taxation of church property, said: "In 1900, without a check, it is safe to say that this church property which pays no tax will reach a sum exceeding $3,000,000,000. So vast a sum receiving all the protection of the government without bearing its proportion of the burdens and expenses of the same, will not be looked upon acquiescently by those who have to pay taxes. In a growing country, where real estate enhances so rapidly with time as in the United States, there is scarcely a limit to the wealth that may be acquired by corporations, religious or otherwise, if allowed to retain real estate without taxation."

History is said to repeat itself, and the United States are on a fair way of reaching a condition which took place in England at one time, and in France, Italy, Spain, South Germany, Mexico, and some of the South and Central American Republics. In these countries corporated religious wealth became so great that it crippled their resources, paralyzed industry, and produced political and social ambitions which were only alleviated by wholesale confiscation. The taxation of church property is in the interest of American principles, and in harmony with the experience of nations. Exemption is a relic of the principle of church and state, inherited from the Old World, and not yet eliminated from our political system.

MADISON C. PETERS.

THE RELATION OF SPAIN TO HER GOVERNMENT.

THE misgovernment of Spain is a curiosity of Europe. There is no reason, that any superficial observer can indicate, why it should be so infernal. The Spaniards are not slow-witted, they are not cowardly, nor are they yet reputed to have lost all sense of national honor; thus it is not easy at first to

apprehend why a power once so great, and still presumably capable of greatness, is collapsing like a slit balloon.

The foreign student of this cause must realize and bear in mind one need pre-eminently sovereign. He must not live, if even for years, in one quarter of Spain alone, in a capital of the east, or of the west, or of the south or north, but in *all*, and then he will see what we may be sure the present administrators of the Peninsula have shrewdly seen and acted on from boyhood, that the control demanded is not that of one country, but of many. Herein, in a word, lies the exact solution of the national distress, and though unreasoning historians condemn the old Castilian and Aragonese kings for subdividing their domains among their children, there is no gainsaying that each province was happier, and richer, and stronger when it was a kingdom of itself, while neither in these days (perhaps the hour is not yet ripe!) have the several divisions of Spain learned to profit by a single monarch or a single ministry.

For, as I say, it is not one kingdom but an agglomeration of kingdoms. The Catalan has French blood, no little of the French industry, and the thriftiness of the French lower classes. The Castilian is of pure descent, boastful of the luxuries of his capital—certainly the most sterilely situated, the least attractive, and one of the poorest of European capitals —and ridiculously disdainful of his neighbors. The Catalan or Galician is all for work, and the guitar-tinkling Andalusian is disgusting in his eye. The Andalusian is more than half a Moor, as may be seen in divers characteristics, patent enough to a resident in Andalusia, but which it would be idle to enumerate here. He in his turn detests his northern brethren of the spade and goad because they rise with the lark, and are weak enough to pay a moiety of his own taxes; while his spleen rises at the bare mention of the Englishman or German, who bleed his country by the mines and railways he has refused to work himself. A table of better class Spaniards of different parts or even cities is an invariable feud, as, through communicativeness, or thoughtlessness, or native bad taste, they cannot avoid treading on ground where they are sure to clash. Thus, more or less offensively, the Valencian vaunts his fruit and vegetable produce; the Barcelonese his industry and early rising, and invested capital; the Madrileño the extravagances and shows of Madrid; the Andalusian his wines; and each envies the other for what he lacks himself, declining to admit the possibility of a mutually advantageous exchange of morals or of commerce, or of single-hearted combination against a common foe.

The Ministry capable of well controlling these, the many Spains, would therefore require (and this I freely grant) to be something quite abnormal. But as a matter of fact not only is no tentative effort made to supply a makeshift, a something that would keep going the machinery of a marvellously productive land, requiring physiographically next to no control, but the partition of the commonwealth is employed by those who climb into power as a *sine qua non* for their private self-advancement. By a single day of concert the present or any other conceivable Spanish Ministry would be tumbled to the ground like a house of cards. It exists, not by any *consensus* of the masses, but as a defiant self-elected organism, challenging the numerical weakness of what brute force is likely to be brought against it. Thus the case is not between the Spanish government and Spain, but between the Spanish government and Catalonia, the Spanish government and Andalusia, the Spanish government and Aragon, and so forth; and, taking

its adversaries one by one, as in the fable of the faggots, it can break their backs at will.

Coming to the ministers themselves, who certainly from the time of Godoy have traded on this unfortunate national condition, they require to be criticised as are the ministers of no other country in the civilized world. These are not governors so much as speculators in government. They do not serve their country, nor, in justice to themselves, do they profess to. They have made their choice and are pleased with it, nor, in their victims, do they look to delicacy of speech, much less defence or confidence. For sundry millions of pesetas voted them by the Cortes for various purposes, and never applied, nor (thanks to the disunion of Spanish character I have explained) seriously enquired after, they have elected to chance the obloquy of their own nation, and the contempt and wonder of others; wonder, because no serious foreigner can ever wholly train himself to understand wherein consists the government of Spain. An exception to prove the rule of these established malversations may be cited in the Marquis of Cabriñana, the young nobleman who not long ago lifted up his voice to protest, in the people's interest, against the defalcations of the Alcalde of Madrid, through whose hands had passed thousands upon thousands of pounds for which he could make no shadow of an effort to account. The same holds good of all grades of those who hold office in this country; to be otherwise would *ipso facto* be to disqualify, to be put on trial, as happened to the Marquis, before a partial judge and advocates, and bought out at a subsequent election.

By some strange accident (I hope it is), the almost entire burden of the ministerial peculations falls on the shoulders of the poorest and hardest-working of the population—on weary schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, on ill-paid artisans and half-naked *carabineros* and village folk—while the clergy, who have always played, and always will play, an ignoble part in Spanish history, by obeying the wishes of the ministry and keeping the toiling victims at a safe dead level of ignorance, are petted and privileged far in advance of their miserable deserts, and have their children maintained at the expense of the State—that is, of their parishioners.

The Spaniard, then, conscious of his "spirit of localism," as Borrow called it, has not, or believes he has not, the remedy of union against these common oppressors. He therefore deteriorates into a sullen, fatal passiveness, and if party feeling is to some countries apparently dangerous by reason of high temper and other insignificant causes, woe to the country where there is none at all; where, in a word, the people cannot find a minister good enough for some, at least, to make him their ideal. The Spaniard is no partisan. Whatever it may be, he is a foe to the existing government, because he knows it is a synonym for extortion. He has no Gladstone, no Primrose Day. He does not wear a colored favor at elections and throw up his hat and vote for so and so. As a spectator of his own impoverishment he bitterly looks on at the one who assumes office, wondering, if such a one be minister, what he will have to pay. For he does not buy—he wastes. The taxes of other peoples procure them commodities little less essential than their daily bread, but the Spaniard pays, and pays heavily and often, and in return his roads are impassable, his children are unschooled, and if he become quite a beggar, as is sooner or later likely, there is no refuge for him.

I will give what struck me as a very vivid illustration of the hatred these people bear their government, for such an instance might be heard in

any quarter of the land. One evening, in the Bay of Cadiz, returning from on board a foreign vessel, I was being rowed past the Spanish ironclad now "finishing," the "*Carlos Quinto.*" The monster looked unsightly enough in her crude state, a blotchy, unpainted, rusty red from stem to stern, while the tinkle of a deliberately plied hammer on some loose plate gave an idea of unsecureness to the whole fabric. I asked my boatman how long she had been laid down. "Two years," he replied, and with a wry face, and a gesture expressive of drawing money from his pocket, he named the conservative and liberal leaders of his government in the same breath. "Curse them," he added, in a tone so horribly deliberate and sincere, it sounded almost as a reversed Angelus, floating over the still water to the ministerial condemnation. There was no marvel in his vehemence. In the *astilleros* of Ferrol the "*Cardinal Cisneros*" has been already five and a half years building, and when she will be fit to work, or steam, or fight—who knows? Not I, neither the Spanish Minister of Marine.

"*Fiate de la Virgen y no corras,*" runs the national proverb—"trust in the Virgin, and don't run"—and with this policy pursued to the letter, in Cuba, and the schoolrooms, and the shipyards, the ministers count the notes wrung from a suffering people, and smilingly protest they will be soon a first-rate naval power, and that there is no country in the world so patriotic and so generous as Spain.

L. WILLIAMS.

NOTE.—As I have mentioned schools several times in the course of this essay, I give two instances of the present state of education. In the province of Guadalajara there are something over two hundred and fifty schoolmasters whose individual salaries do not reach five hundred pesetas per annum. The school of Cañamares receives an *annual* grant of forty-six pesetas (eight dollars, roughly). In spite of this scale of payment, the Department of Education owes the schools and teachers of this single province *one hundred and ninety-three thousand pesetas.* And the schoolmasters of Vêlez-Malaga, literally at the point of starvation, have addressed a piteous circular, imploring aid, to the sovereigns and heads of other states, including the President of the French Republic.

Y esto se llama la hidalguia Española!

A DEFENCE OF OUR ELECTORAL SYSTEM.

A DISTINGUISHED contributor to the last number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW points out a serious defect in our Presidential electoral system; he shows that from the election of State electors on a common State ticket there results a great inequality in the value of individual votes in different States; that a voter in a smaller State, compared with a voter in a larger State, is at a grave disadvantage. The remedy proposed is to choose electors by districts instead of by States (except as to the two electors at large, who, as now, would be voted for on a State ticket).

As, by the Constitution, each State may direct the manner in which its electors shall be appointed, this remedy means an amendment requiring all States to appoint their electors by district electors. A constitutional amendment being an affair of great moment, the proposal invites public concern; and the following review of the arguments set forth is contributed to the general discussion of the matter.

It is asked whether it is a larger privilege to vote for twenty or thirty

electors than it is to vote for three or five. It is indeed a larger privilege; that is, if there is no detracting circumstances; we must remember that the question has further reference to the number of other voters with whom the privilege is shared. The prerogative of suffrage is as to its value one of mutual restriction.

"Does one vote cast for each of thirty electors have a greater power than does one vote cast for three electors?" Yes; *if* the first voting population is less than ten times the second voting population, but not otherwise. The power of a vote depends on two factors: first, the number of State electors; and second, the fraction that the voter is of the voting population of the State.

The argument reviewed overlooks the second factor. May this be done? Suppose that in Montana a voter has, owing to immigration, twelve times as many fellow-voters as formerly (the electoral vote remaining the same). Does his vote have the same force as before? Or suppose that his fellow voters are only one-twelfth as numerous. Does not his vote increase in force? If this is denied, let us suppose that it does not and after reducing the number of voters lower and lower till only our one voter remains, we shall find him absolutely controlling the State electoral vote. Yet by the supposition his vote has not gained in force, which shows the supposition inadmissible. The following, though not a parallel, is an illustration. Which is preferable, a chance of gaining thirty dollars or a chance of gaining three? Does it not depend somewhat on the relative probability of the two chances?

A voter's influence is the quotient of the number of State electors divided by the number of the voting population, and since these numbers are directly proportional (a proper assumption since the argument does not concern Senatorial electors) the quotient is constant. In other words the discovered inequality is imaginary. A man once invented an ingenious machine; it had one defect, however, which was that it would not work. In this case the remedy for the inequality does not work, as there is no work for it.

It is argued: "In the State of New York the voter casts a ballot for each of thirty-six electors. His vote is counted for each, and each elector chosen by that ballot votes for President; so that the vote of one man bears directly on thirty-six votes in the Electoral College. In one respect a man has but one voice, but that one voice is potential in filling many seats in the body which decides the election. . . . In another State of less population a voter has a voice in the election of three electors. . . . In this condition of things it is pretty evident that the voter in New York has twelve times the power in the choice of President that he possesses who must exercise the right of suffrage in the smaller State." This argument assumes that a voter's power is unaffected by the number of those who are admitted with him to the polls. A child estimates five pennies as more valuable than four dimes: five is greater than four; but even a young child is quick to understand that the more who are admitted with him to divide a cake, the smaller his piece will be.

In the last quotation, the New York voter is spoken of as choosing his State's electors; but each voter only *helps* in the choosing; and it will be noticed that while the New York voter helps to choose *more* electors he helps *less* to choose them. So also when we are told that his vote "bears directly on thirty-six votes in the Electoral College" and that his voice is

"potential in filling many seats," may we not ask *how strongly* it bears, and *to what degree* it is potential? This consideration is ignored.

"Is not the vote multiplied or its power increased in proportion to the number of electors it helps to elect?" Not altogether; in proportion to the number of electors it helps to elect *and* to the share it has in their election. Increasing the number of electors increases a voter's power, but a corresponding change in the voting population decreases it back in the same proportion inversely.

Suppose New York and Montana each carried by 1,100 votes. Now have the 1,100 voters in New York twelve times the power of those in Montana? What 1,100 voters in New York? Why, those that compose the majority. But who are they? Is there any rule by which they can be pointed out? We may pick out in Erie County 1,100 men who voted the winning ticket, and say that if they had voted on the other side it would have changed the result, but can we credit them with the election? Not unless we also credit the election in turn to each such group of 1,100 in the whole State who voted the winning ticket.

It comes to this that no 1,100 men but the half million and odd victors have carried the State. The 1,100 majority cannot be given local habitations and names. The half million and odd majority is composed of real men, but the 1,100 majority is a category; and to imagine it real beings is a mistake as great, though of an opposite kind, as that of the man who picked up a chair and said "I hold in my hands a noun."

It would be wrong to argue that if the State has been carried by 1,100 votes, 1,100 votes have carried the State. "*By*" does not here denote the agent but the measure of excess. We could not deny that the farmer sold the wheat, because the wheat was sold *by the bushel*. Usage permits many ambiguous expressions, but we must not be misled by them in reasoning. Nor could it be argued, under our system a majority wins (suppose two parties only); but the majority was 1,100 votes; then 1,100 votes won. The middle term is double; "majority" means first the larger of the two divisions into which the people divide themselves, and second the excess of the larger division over the smaller. Again in the expression "carried by a majority of 1,100," "of" denotes a property of the majority, not its composition. Here are three instances of words that may lead to sophistry.

Suppose New York and Montana each carried by 1,100 votes; a change of 600 votes in each State would mean a change of thirty-six and three electoral votes respectively. A change of 600 in New York would indeed have twelve times the effect of such a change in Montana, *if* no other votes changed in the opposite direction. The reversing of the total electoral vote of the State really depends not only on the change of 600 votes, but also and much more largely on the *permanence* of the votes which the 600 went to increase. Who will say that keeping the old ranks steady is not as important as enlisting recruits, however less spectacular? Of what good would be recruits from the enemy if offset by deserters to the enemy? A man standing on another man's shoulders and waving a flag should not attribute the elevation of the flag entirely to his own stature. He would see his mistake if the man below were to withdraw his support.

"Nor is it possible that twelve votes cast in Montana can equal one vote cast in New York, for the one vote touches the election of thirty-six electors in New York, while the twelve votes in Montana can only affect three electors." This leads to a startling conclusion; if true for Montana it is true

for another State (they are all smaller than New York), and if true for twelve votes it is true for a larger number. It follows, for instance, that it is not possible that 90,000 votes in Pennsylvania can equal one vote cast in New York, for the one vote touches the election of thirty-six electors in New York while the 90,000 votes in Pennsylvania can only affect thirty-two electors. Can we believe anything like this? The gist of the matter is that one vote in Montana, while it "touches" only three electors, touches them *twelve times as hard* as a New York vote touches its thirty-six.

"If the ballot for each elector were cast separately he of Montana would vote three times and he of New York thirty-six times. Say not then that the ways of the system are equal." Yes, the New York man would vote oftener. It is as though he would travel around the State and vote in each district; but then he would have everybody in the State travelling around and voting with him and so lessening the worth of each of his votes.

It is all a matter of quantity and quality, or, as the poet says, of "fineness compensating size." The New York man's vote is more bulky, but it has a lower specific gravity; it is more extended, but it is not so intense; it denotes more, but it connotes less; all in inverse variation.

The New York Electoral College is like a machine of which the voters are the power and thirty-six electoral votes sent to Washington the work. The voters of Montana are the power of another like machine and three votes sent to Washington are their work. Now, the argument concerning district electors only, we may assume that the voters in the two States are, as regards numbers, as thirty-six to three, and since their work is as thirty-six to three, they must individually be of equal power. Taking the true ratio of population, about thirty-four to one, we can argue that for a stronger reason an individual voter in New York has not more influence than one in Montana. If of round lead bullets a given number of one lot weighs so much and twelve times that number of another lot weighs twelve times as much, we know that the two lots of bullets are of the same calibre.

As to electors at large we read: "The thing sought being equality in the power of the individual voter in all the States, the principle contended for is not violated by the electors of senatorial electors on a common ticket for the State." Let us see. A Montana and a New York voter each vote for two senatorial electors, but the first voter has more influence in the selection of his two for the reason that there are fewer other persons who have any voice in the matter; he is a member of a *closer corporation*. To fit the system proposed, senatorial electors should be abolished.

For the proposed method there is one good argument, proportional minority representation. This argument is advanced but strangely confused; the *majority* is spoken of as being overborne, as though it were not the fundamental principle of democracy that the people are free to marshal themselves as they like and that the division which is out-numbered can never assume to be the majority whatever its other pretensions.

These conclusions seem to follow: First, that as to district electors, a voter in a smaller State is not at a grievous disadvantage compared with one in a larger State, but is equal to him; second, that as to senatorial electors the second voter is not equal to the first, but at a disadvantage; third, that the proposed system of electing district electors by districts would, as between voters in smaller and larger States, leave the matter unchanged, and that the argument of inequality has no weight.

NEAL EWING.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXXI.

DECEMBER, 1896.

"THE ENGINEER IN NAVAL WARFARE."

BY REAR ADMIRAL JOHN G. WALKER, U. S. N., FORMERLY COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE SQUADRON OF EVOLUTION; CAPTAIN A. T. MAHAN, U. S. N., AUTHOR OF "THE INFLUENCE OF SEA-POWER UPON HISTORY," AND FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE; CAPTAIN R. D. EVANS, U. S. N., COMMANDING THE BATTLE-SHIP "INDIANA," AND LIEUTENANT S. A. STAUNTON, U. S. N.

I.

My attention has been called to a number of papers, which, under the above general title, were published in the May number of the North American Review.

These articles were written with a purpose. It is manifestly their object to present certain opinions for acceptance, and to incline the public mind to a belief in the desirability of certain changes. They proclaim that engineering is now the leading science, and the care and management of steam machinery the leading art, of naval warfare; that seamen are simply a left-over product of the age of sails, who embarrass naval efficiency, but whom no one has yet devised means to get rid of, and that the

Copyright, 1896, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

engineer is the "great factor in modern warfare" and must be recognized and honored as such.

These views, if presented only to military men, would need no refutation. They are essentially incorrect, and they are opposed to the principles, practice, and experience of all the navies of the world. But presented to the general reading public—a public for the most part not informed in naval affairs—they are dangerous, so far as their fallacies might gain headway and influence, to the efficiency of the naval service.

I do not take part in the so-called "Line and Staff" controversies of the service, nor adopt the partisan views which sometimes enter into the discussion of measures advocated by one portion of the officers of the navy, and opposed by those of other branches. Having had forty-six years of active service, having reached the highest rank in the navy, and looking forward to retirement within a year, I have no object in contributing to this discussion other than to maintain the efficiency of the navy. With whatever authority the service and experience of a lifetime in our own navy give me—a service varying from that of midshipman in charge of a boat to that of admiral in command of a fleet; an experience including the War of the Rebellion, aided by contact with foreign navies, and improved by the study of foreign naval systems—I shall endeavor to show what the conditions of naval efficiency are, and to what extent and with what uniformity those conditions obtain throughout the navies of the world.

A navy exists for war alone. If peace between nations were definitely assured the navies of the world would be disbanded, their vessels so far as adaptable would be converted to commercial uses, their formidable weapons would be placed in museums, their sailors would embark in other pursuits.

The cost of constructing a modern navy is enormous. A battle-ship costs from three to five millions; a heavy armed cruiser two millions, or more; a gunboat several hundred thousand. Even a torpedo boat—a mosquito of the fleet—costs in the neighborhood of a hundred thousand dollars.

The maintenance of these floating fortresses—the cost of coal and stores, the pay and provisioning of men, the support of dockyards, depots, and hospitals—forms no inconsiderable part of a nation's burdens. And all this expenditure would

be without excuse were it not that a powerful navy is not only a protection to a country in the event of war, but operates to a very considerable degree as an insurance against war, since nations, like individuals, hesitate to attack a powerful and prepared enemy.

War, then, being the sole object of a navy's existence, its organization and its administration should be controlled entirely by the demands of efficiency when engaged in war, and the number, rank, and duty of officers should be determined by these demands alone. Two conditions of a navy, one for peace and one for war, are inadmissible. A navy may be upon a "peace establishment," when there will be fewer ships in commission, and their crews or complements will be reduced; but the framework for immediate expansion must be maintained intact. The organization must be such that the navy can be rapidly "mobilized," to use a comprehensive military term, without any shock or confusion.

It follows, therefore, that in time of peace the organization, discipline, habits, and spirit of naval life should be such as to meet the exigencies of war. War will unavoidably bring new strains, privations, and responsibilities; but the minor details, the routine, methods, and habitual relations should continue to run in the same channels.

A navy is essentially a military organization in time of war; and therefore it must be essentially a military organization in time of peace. That is, military ideas must be the controlling ideas, the military element must be the predominant element, and the military men who train the crews in warlike exercises, and who in battle will employ and direct all the weapons of offense and defense, must exercise authority and command.

The same conditions obtain in all the navies of the world, and the same principles are everywhere accepted. Those which determine the efficiency of the navy of a republic determine also the efficiency of the navy of a constitutional monarchy, or of that of an absolute monarchy; of the American navy, of the British navy, or of that of Russia. The political organizations of states differ, but the organization of their armed forces is fundamentally the same. Illustrations may therefore be drawn from foreign services with every assurance of their fitness, and precedents may be quoted with confidence. And when the experience of

our own service is sustained by that of every other modern navy, the conclusions derived therefrom are entitled to the weight of established facts.

The naval engineers maintain that, since steam is now the sole motive power of men-of-war, and is, in addition so largely employed afloat for minor purposes, they should be considered of much more importance, and should be more independent and have more place and authority. In other words, they claim that steam has revolutionized navies, and that the engineer has practically superseded the seaman. The line officers of the navy—the military branch—the officers who have in our own navy as in all other navies, from the time of their origin to the present time, commanded ships and fleets, conducted expeditions, fought battles, and made history, are the seamen or "sailors" referred to in this claim. Drake, Raleigh, Hawke, St. Vincent, De Ruyter, Nelson, Decatur, Perry, Farragut, and Porter, were among the predecessors of the "sailors" whose day is said to have passed, were brilliant ornaments of that profession now said to be abridged by steam.

It is a very narrow and limited mind which sees in a great art one only of its applications. Seamanship has not passed and will not pass. As long as ships float upon the sea there will be sailors in command. Whether as peaceful traders they pursue the highways of ocean commerce, or as armed vessels seek the military control which protects those highways, seamanship will be the art by means of which they are conducted upon their voyages, through which they are made most effective. It is the habit and the knowledge of the sea and of the ship in which one sails. It existed in the galley period. It was not created by sails and it has not been destroyed by steam. It is neither a lost art nor a decaying art, but it is an art of changing application, and its demands now are as great as they ever were. The seaman of any age must understand all the forces with which he has to deal, and in the present day must understand steam. He need not be an expert, practical machinist, but he must know the limitations of steam machinery, and the laws of its care and use.

Naval line officers generally are fully up to the demands of modern seamanship. The line officers of the United States navy are especially well qualified in this respect. They are well grounded at Annapolis in mathematics and natural science, and

in the application of both to machinery; and the value of their training has been shown by the important part which they have taken in the design and construction of our new ships. The fields of ordnance and torpedo engineering, of electric lighting and ventilation, have been occupied almost exclusively by line officers. Some of them are not only accomplished engineers, but practical machinists. They have fulfilled all the demands of modern seamanship, and have gone far beyond them.

The seaman employs and directs all the forces of the ship which he commands. He employed the rowers of the galley period, the sails of a later age, and he employs the steam of to-day. The engineer manages the engines of a ship; but he manages them at the direction of the seaman on deck, who orders them to be slowed, stopped, backed or run ahead at his own sole discretion and responsibility. Marine engineering has reached an extraordinary development in the transatlantic greyhounds of the present day. Their principal quality is great and sustained speed, but the engineer of the "St. Paul" is as absolutely under the control of the seaman who directs the ship as is the mechanic who runs the engines of a tugboat for two dollars a day. The engineer of any man-of-war from a torpedo boat to a battle-ship is in the same position. It is his business to keep his machinery in good order and to run it as directed. Its employment is entirely in the seaman's hands.

And this is not solely a question of the special fitness of the seaman. It is an inevitable feature of the situation. The engineer is below, where he can see nothing but his engines. If he abandoned his engines and came on deck he would cease to be the engineer.

I have spoken of seamen in general. Seamanship, however, is only one of the necessary qualifications of a naval officer. His other acquirements include all branches of the art of war—discipline, organization, strategy, tactics, and the knowledge of the weapons and resources of war. This comprises in itself a profession whose demands have rapidly multiplied during the last generation.

The development of steam has been great; but the development of weapons and defense has proceeded by leaps and bounds. No discoveries or improvements in machinery have caused among engineers such a readjustment of accepted opinions as line officers

have been obliged to make since confronted with high powered guns, Harveyized armor, smokeless powder, and high explosives. Constant study, constant experiment, and unwearied effort have been required to adapt the rapidly changing means of naval warfare to their effective use.

This military training and military knowledge are of supreme importance to the purposes of a navy; and the men who make it their profession are in fact as in name the "line" of that organization. In the business of warfare the men who direct the operations of war and handle the weapons of war are those upon whom success in war depends. The duties of those who do not take a distinctly military part, while necessary and important, are adjunct and essentially subordinate.

The man who takes no initiative, determines no issues, however intelligent and trustworthy, plays a subordinate part; and such a man is the naval engineer in battle.

"The value of a ship is no greater than the value of the man who commands her," is practically an axiom among naval men; and this means that the effective employment of the ship is wholly dependent upon the qualities of her captain. This high responsibility falls upon line officers and upon them only. It is true that only one among the line officers of a ship carries that responsibility at any one time, but in the event of his death or disability the next in rank succeeds to the command. A lieutenant in a turret, half blinded by powder smoke, wholly intent upon the rapid service of his guns, may be called away by the information that all his superiors have fallen, and that upon him depends the direction of the ship and the issue of the fight. No such duty does devolve or can devolve upon an engineer. His duty remains the same, and remains subordinate throughout all the phases of the battle.

His position in a naval organization is fixed and limited by these conditions. They are the same in all navies, and the military relations which flow from them are the same. In the British Navy, the Queen's Regulations place the engineers in the "Civil Branch," and specify in clear and unmistakable language the authority over them of the military branch. In continental navies, the sea-going engineers, called with a proper distinction of language "mechanicians," are simply artisans, and are nearly all promoted from the ranks after an experience

which has rendered them practically expert in the management of marine steam machinery. They are trained as our locomotive engineers are trained.

The engineers in the United States Navy are already better off than in foreign services. They have more pay, more rank, and more official consideration than in other navies; but the difference is one of degree and not one of kind. Their duty determines their position, and it must remain essentially the same.

And in considering this position it must not be forgotten that the care and management of steam machinery afloat is not "engineering." Engineering is a liberal and progressive profession, and finds its exercise in design and construction. When the engines are built and placed in a ship they are turned over to the mechanician or engine driver, a trained artisan skilled in practical work, but not necessarily or generally a man of liberal education. The former is a profession; the latter is a trade.

The engineer, as an engineer, does not follow the ship away from the dock-yard. If he takes charge of her engines afloat, he ceases to practise his profession of engineering, and becomes an engine driver. It is a defect in our own naval organization that the same class of men perform the two classes of duties; that engineers, capable of good work in their profession, are sent to sea to do as a matter of habit and routine the work of artisans. There should be a division of duties, and engineering should be placed in its proper position, as it is in continental navies, where men of high professional capacity do little or no sea service, and in fact constitute a different branch. The men who go to sea in charge of engines should be mainly practical men—skilled machinists—who would not rise above warrant rank, the class of men who run the engines of the merchant service, even of the great passenger steamers, and who are found in the engine-rooms of the British, French, Italian, and German navies.

Such a change would not only be good administration in itself, but would relieve the navy from the discontent now felt by highly educated young men who go to sea in the position of engineer of the watch.

This position, I repeat in conclusion, depends upon its duties, and its occupant cannot rise above them, no matter what his intelligence, education, or professional value. At sea he is an

engine driver with no demands and no duties beyond those imposed upon the practical mechanician in the same place.

J. E. WALKER.

II.

ALL questions that arise among men have a tendency to become involved, in the course of discussion, with a cloud of details, sometimes germane to the matter in hand, sometimes entirely foreign to it, but conducing to withdraw attention from the central facts, usually few and simple, which are really decisive of the matter in hand.

A navy is, first and last, a military body of which the distinguishing characteristic is extreme mobility. This characteristic derives, primarily, from the element in which navies act—the water—which lends itself with peculiar facility to the purposes of movement. The element remaining constant, this statement is true of all ages, the particular motive force in use at any era being simply incidental; whether it be the wind, steam, electricity—which the future may bring—or men's muscles, in the handling of oars, which, in the case of military navies, was the historical antecedent of wind and steam alike. Mobility is the permanent characteristic, the end or object in view; the power which gives motion, the means or method of obtaining motion, is transient—of one sort to-day, of another to-morrow. Results, not methods, are the considerations which concern practical men of action. It is the mobility, and not how the mobility at a particular period is got, that constitutes the peculiar value of navies.

Mobility, the power of useful movement, resolves into two constituents. There is the motive force, the power to move at all, whatever be the source from which it springs—wind, steam, electricity, or animal force, as with oars, and vehicles drawn by horses; and there is the directive power, which, and which alone, insures that the motion, instead of being aimless, or even harmful, shall be useful, intelligent in its action, and subject to necessary changes, such as turning or stopping to avoid injury. A steamer under full power abandoned by the helmsman, a carriage in mid-career drawn by spirited horses and abandoned by the driver, are illustrations of motive power abandoned by directive power.

These two components of mobility are logically distinct. They can be separated in idea; and although they must be combined,

unified, in any moving object, unless destruction is to ensue, yet it is possible, and may be necessary, to separate them for practical consideration. Take for instance the unit man, regarded as a moving object. The power of his legs is one thing, the sight of his eyes is another; one is the motive force, the other the directive, both administered by the same person. Yet in that same person they are divided, separable in thought and act, as any man will find who with undiminished bodily strength attempts to walk in dangerous places of a dark night. His motive efficiency has been divided; the power of motion remains, the directive power is withdrawn. He is the illustration of the steamer abandoned by the helmsman—or, rather, by him who sums up all the directive forces, the man in charge of the deck.

Historically it has happened, for a period comparatively brief, as the world's life goes, that in the unit ship the control of the two elements of mobility could be combined in the same man. The wind, as the source of power, compelled the means whereby it was utilized, the spars and sails, to be exterior to the body of the ship, and there they could be embraced under the control of the same eye, which scanned at once the direction the ship was taking, and the signs of the weather, which dictated the management of the motive enginery. It was not so with the galley, where the position of the toiling oarsmen, their backs turned to the direction the ship was taking, symbolized vividly the sphere to which the motive power must be relegated, when the immediate management of it was forced to leave the deck. That period arrived necessarily with the steam engine. Constructional considerations alone, the distribution of weights, would have enforced it; the exigencies of military navies make it yet more necessary to sink to the lowest depths of the ship that blind and dumb enginery which can move, and can do nothing more. For its security, it, which cannot protect itself, must be protected by submersion, and by accumulation of artificial protection in the shape of armor. The engineer and the engines must be made safe to the utmost of human precautions, must be withdrawn to the utmost from exposure to military hazard, because they cannot defend themselves, and because power to move is essential to the efficiency of a ship of war. For this reason, protection, in the strict sense of the word, must be withdrawn for the most part from the combatant force, because guns, in the main, can and

should defend themselves. Offence is the best defence, and in the due study of that simple principle will be found the true solution of the disposition of armor between the batteries and the engines. Protection, except for the directing force—the commanding officer and the helm—will have to be withdrawn in large part from above.

The quarrel between the members of the body is an old story. No nation, no community probably, exists without parties; they are perhaps the necessity, certainly a concomitant, of healthy life. The reconcilement in any body can only be reached by a candid recognition of the proper functions of each member. The head may not say to the feet, "I have no need of you"; but for all that we don't undertake to see with our feet. No combination of persons can act effectually, unless some provision is made whereby unity of action can be insured; and in matters of great moment, even in civil life, executive action can only be strong by being unified in one head. All attempts at a many-headed executive, meant as a provision against tyranny, have resulted in discord and feebleness. Two cannot walk together, unless they be agreed; and if they disagree, there can be no unity, unless it be clearly understood that in such case one commands and the other obeys.

In the unit ship we have side by side the two elements, the motive force and the directive force, which, taken together, constitute the efficiency of the ship as ship. When they fail to agree—and that dispute, seemingly radical, does arise is notorious—upon what principle shall unity be preserved? Shall the eyes, or shall the feet, dictate what shall be the direction of the moving body?

The argument so far has been confined to the consideration of the ship in general, without special reference to the naval ship as a military organization. Before touching upon that, and so leaving the first part of the subject, it is desirable to meet the statement often advanced, that the introduction of steam has reduced the functions and the responsibility of the officer in charge of the deck, be he the captain or his youngest lieutenant. The statement is absolutely erroneous. A particular kind of accidents has been eliminated, skin-deep injuries of splitting sails and carrying away spars, but beyond that steam has not diminished, but rather increased, the danger and the scope of accidents

at sea. Steam has facilitated movement, and movement quickened has increased as well as diminished danger. Seamen are by it not only tempted, but compelled, to incur new risks—to curtail the margin of safety—a process which entails the necessity of greater skill, greater readiness, and precision of handling. No safer vessel at this moment floats the sea, as against the dangers of the sea, then the sailing ship-of-war of recent date, excluding the smallest classes. From the sloop-of-war to the ship-of-the-line, with average care, they were safe in all kinds of weather, while the danger of fatal collision was for them practically non-existent. The great danger of going to sea now is collision, whether with other ships or with the shore, and—whatever constructors may accomplish in the way of minimizing consequences—for the avoidance of collision the man in the engine-room has no more to do, beyond obeying signals from the deck, than a man ashore. All depends upon the watchfulness, the intelligence, and the presence of mind of the man on deck—the repository for the moment of the directive force. This consideration, important in all ships, is tenfold so for ships of war, for all great naval influence depends upon the power of huge ships of war to move in close order and concerted action, the changes incident to which carry a constant and inevitable risk of collision. Safety in such movements depends almost wholly on the man on deck, who sees and orders, and to a wholly inferior degree upon the one who merely obeys signals, the reasons for which he cannot know.

Turning now from the merely nautical side of the question, we shall touch the military side of a ship-of-war very briefly because there is a superficial admission that the efficiency of every military unit—army, regiment, fleet, ship-of-war—however composite in its general make-up, depends upon command being centred in one man, who is responsible to none below him, and who must receive unquestioning obedience. The admission, I say, is superficial, by which I do not mean that it is feigned, but that it does not fully understand, for it sees, recognizes, and admits unity, not in the *power* of command which is represented in one individual, but only in the *person* of him who is the permanent representative. It recognizes the captain, but resents the executive officer and the officer of the watch. The spirit, however, is one. However honest in its denials, the objection lies equally against the

captain's authority, and historically has spoken against it. The musty files of our own navy contain the record of disputes as to how far a commanding officer could control one of the subordinate bodies constituting his command, and in the British Navy, at the same period, the question of the captain's authority over a class of soldiers on board for the purposes of the ship was brought to a direct issue—the necessity for unity eliciting the strenuous support of Nelson and St. Vincent, the two greatest admirals Great Britain has had. The same repugnance to the demands of military organization appears again in the papers in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW of May last, which have necessitated the present articles. "The naval engineer has urged that military routine, which may be necessary for a marine guard, cannot be applied to the management of the fire-room force."* "There should be extended to the navy the system of the merchant marine, which gives engineers immunity from the interference of mates on deck,"†—*i. e.*, from the officer of the watch.

The difficulty proceeds from a confusion of thought. The unity of a military organization lies not in the *person* of him who is at its head, but in the *power* which he possesses, and of which he is in general the representative. Were it otherwise, detached service would be impossible; power would be inseparable from the person, and where he could not be, power would lapse and anarchy supervene. The power of the captain is not in his own person, any more than that of a lieutenant is in his. True the captain's authority carries with it a certain position and functions, which he cannot divest himself of nor transfer to another; but his power, and that of the lieutenants in their sphere, and of the engineers in theirs, are alike derived, as is the power of the President of the United States himself. It is the kind of the power, and not the receptacle in which it reposes, which is the essential factor. In the state the civil power is supreme; within a military organization the military power is supreme. In the special military organization known as the navy, the directive power and the military power must, from the nature of the case as set forth, go together. The ship must be guided and she must be fought. They who fight must guide; there rests power. Unity also demands that organization and administration, the essential precedents of good fighting, remain in the same hands.

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, May, 1896, p. 518. † *Ibid.*, p. 515.

In any living organization the supreme power never dies. The King never dies; and against the possibility of the President dying we have made an elaborate provision, which sufficiently speaks for the danger it seeks to avoid. But in the slow moving action of the huge organisms that we call nations and governments, there is time enough for Kings and Presidents to sleep, to be off guard; whereas, in the rapid movements of ships, and the frequent sudden vicissitude of sea-life, the captain—the captain's *power*—cannot sleep; it is plain to say his *person* must. No more than the proverbial switch-tender can he, as a habit, be on duty twenty hours out of the twenty-four. Hence arises the necessity for the watch officer, who is in charge of the deck, and vested while so with all the captain's power for the conduct of that which goes on on deck, or pertains to the direction. He holds this control not because he is the captain or lieutenant, by grade and title, but because of the office he is then filling. Is this considered an extravagant claim—unlimited? It is not, because all military power, however absolute in its essence and claim to obedience, is limited strictly by law, responsibility to which holds in check every person invested with it. From censure to dismissal from the service is the range of penalty, for any military officer who oversteps the limits which law has laid down to control his use of a power which is otherwise absolute.

And as it is on deck, so it is in the engine-room. The man in charge there, himself in his sphere, exercises a control as absolute as the captain and the officer of the watch—like them absolute, like them limited. But there are two on duty at the same time—the deck officer and the engine officer, the directive and the motive forces. The unity of result demands that they be not independent. One must be the superior, and it must be the one who has charge of the directive force, as that which is the more essential to the safety and government of the vessel; not because the one man is superior to the other man, but because the one power is more important than the other.

From the same confusion of thought between the person and the power arises the claim—preposterous to line officers—that the titles of the line are in some way essential to the authority and dignity of engineer officers. A captain's authority rests upon the power necessary to the commander of a ship, whatever he be called. The deck officer's rests not upon the title he bears,

lieutenant or what-not, but upon the duty laid upon his shoulders and the power needed for its discharge. Similarly, that of the engineer is conditioned upon the duties he has to fulfil. To call him a lieutenant does not help matters in the least, for the lieutenant's authority does not depend upon his title. If, however, the titles, which in the process of years have come to designate certain duties of the directive officers, are sought for those who manipulate the motive forces on the ground of the latter's dignity, the reply is simple. The republican idea knows nothing of titles, except as convenient names which designate duties. It would be quite as fitting to call a senator of the United States a duke or an earl for the sake of his dignity, as to call an engineer a lieutenant or a captain for the sake of his. An engineer is called an engineer because he has to do with engines; to call him a lieutenant simply obscures his functions. The little glamour that in some eyes seems to hang round the mere titles, admiral, captain, lieutenant, etc., is due simply to the fact that they have a somewhat long historical derivation—something of the venerableness of years. The engine is a new comer: it has brought its own nomenclature, including that of those who run it.

A. T. MAHAN.

III.

HAVING commanded three of our modern vessels, I feel that I may contribute my mite towards a fair understanding of the question brought prominently to the public notice by certain articles published in the May number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

An engineer officer of the highest rank gives his views with great freedom as to the defects in the military organization of navies, especially of our own, and the changes which must take place lest they be found wanting in the hour of trial. This able man, gifted as he certainly is, who ought to know thoroughly any subject that he writes about, has never served one day on board a modern vessel of war; yet he tells us that the navies of the world may be put right by simply increasing the number of engineers, and giving them the titles of officers of whose duties they have neither part nor knowledge; and he asserts that this is an imperative reform—the one thing necessary to efficiency.

His demands are seconded by several professors engaged in teaching mechanical engineering in schools and colleges. They agree with Engineer-in-Chief Melville as to the necessity of his remedy, but they find also another one desirable to repair the evils, which, as they can plainly see from their desks, are demoralizing the navy. Their remedy is government aid to the colleges which they represent, and government appointments to their graduates, who will, they assume, have great merit as marine engineers without ever having seen the inside of a ship's engine-room, and a high sense of military discipline without ever having felt its restrictions or exercised its responsibilities.

The three modern ships which I have commanded at different times—the "Yorktown," "New York," and "Indiana"—have received uniform commendation. The records made by the first two demonstrated their efficiency in all departments. This was true of them in the highest sense, and it will be equally true of the "Indiana," our first great battle-ship, when reasonable time and experience shall have familiarized officers and men with her qualities and capacities, and have corrected the mistakes made by people who do not go to sea.

The "Yorktown" steamed from New York to San Francisco, stopping for some time at Valparaiso on important service. Beyond the constant sea-sickness of the Chief Engineer our difficulties arose without exception, from either the ignorance or the carelessness of the shore engineers. Boilers were not protected by zincs, their tubes were pitted, the distillers were incapable of doing the work for which they were designed; yet we did, on board ship, make things go, and the ship was always ready, efficient, and happy. The feeling between line and engineers was one of respect and regard. The vessel was afterwards flagship of the Behring Sea Patrol Fleet, and did her work to the entire satisfaction of everyone, so far as I know, from President Harrison down.

My second command, the "New York," has not had, in my opinion, her superior in any service for efficiency. In the beginning her distilling plant was inadequate, her condenser tubes were wrong, and other small neglects of the shore engineers gave us more or less trouble; but we overcame them all without giving line titles to the engineer officers, or changing their relation to the military organization. They settled down to their work under their able

chief, were happy, contented, and efficient. Her full-speed trials showed clearly the efficient condition of her engine department, and a further test was her long cruise as Admiral Meade's flagship, when accurate handling of engines was uniformly demanded. Her run from New York to Kiel, touching at Southampton and Copenhagen, was made at high speed, and without once stopping the engines to repair. When inspected at half-past one o'clock in the morning without previous notice by the German Emperor, her condition received unqualified praise from him and the able officers of his staff. Naval representatives of all nations at the great Kiel review, looking keenly for defects, were able only to admire in every particular. Later, in England she was visited by representatives of the Admiralty and other officers of high rank and much experience. All without exception commended her heartily, remarking only upon what seemed to them the large number of commissioned engineers in her complement. This military estimate by military men of a man-of-war's efficiency may with confidence be set against the opinions of engineers, either naval or civil, who "stick to their desks and never go to sea."

The battleship "Indiana," my present command, promises to equal the others in efficiency when minor defects of construction and equipment have been overcome. These are to be expected in a pioneer vessel of a new type, and the larger and more powerful the vessel—*i. e.*, the greater the variety and complications of weapons and machinery—the more numerous they will be. They are all defects in mechanical design and execution, and in remedying them the line officers under my command exhibit a resource and facility fully equal to that of the engineers. The joint efforts of all are rapidly making the "Indiana" the peer of any battleship afloat.

It was necessary to relieve her chief engineer, one of the "contemporaries" referred to by Engineer-in-Chief Melville, in the first half-year of her commission, his administration not proving satisfactory. Nor was this due to the "trinity of men claiming to be vested with supreme authority." Bent valve stems, engines unexpectedly starting in dry dock, hot bearings, and a general want of efficiency were caused, not by the "trinity," but by the lack of practical knowledge of modern steam machinery. Educated on a maximum of 40 revolutions a minute, 120 was more than he could grasp.

Natural reasons for natural phenomena always exist. When this chief engineer and one of his assistants assured me that there was no reason for the "Indiana's" engine starting off in dry dock, I felt that it was time to insist upon a change. Neither line titles nor government aid to engineering schools will better this condition; but there is a remedy and one easily applied.

The "trinity," so bitterly referred to, consists of the captain, the executive officer, and the officer of the deck. The captain's authority is not as yet questioned, but the authority which the other two employ, always as delegates or representatives of the captain, is deeply resented. It is, if one believes them, the "hoodoo" of the engineers. Yet this organization is the same in all navies, and is the fruit of all naval experience. It represents discipline and power. It is the fad of to-day in some quarters to pull both down; but it is not a creditable effort for one of the branches of the naval service.

Discipline and executive ability on the part of those in charge are the prime factors of efficiency. Discipline in its highest sense does not exist without willing, hearty, intelligent obedience of orders. A captain can always enforce obedience, but the more force employed, the less real the discipline. I find that the discipline of the engineer's force is not as good as that of the combatant force, and that this is due to the difference in attitude and spirit towards the military organization of the ship. I have the same power over both forces, and have the sole authority to administer rewards and punishments; and if I had the same loyal support from engineer officers that I have from those of the line, the discipline throughout the entire force would speedily become the same.

The engineer officer does not give the same careful attention to his men. He has not, as a rule, the same executive ability as the line officer. He does not lay out work and apportion responsibility so well. His personal sense of discipline is not, in many cases, all that could be desired. The kind of obedience that leads to the greatest efficiency is not always found, and there is a reason for this.

Imagine a naval service in which all the officers of one branch are seeking to obtain the titles of the officers of another and the strictly military branch; to drop the titles which they hold, and which are descriptive of their duties, and assume other titles

which describe the duties of another class of officers. Imagine further that these same officers are also seeking a removal of the demands and restrictions of naval discipline as applied to themselves. Let these officers use every effort to influence public opinion and Congressional action in their favor and against the officers of the military branch; enlist the assistance of societies and unions of men of the same profession as their own in civil life; send circulars to boards of trade; suggest that apparatus, machinery, and professors shall be supplied to colleges at government expense; propose that a certain number of the graduates of these colleges shall receive each year a substantial bounty from the government; and direct all this influence to an attack upon the existing organization of the service to which they belong. Would not a condition of unrest and discontent among them be expected? Would it be surprising to find discipline impaired, its impulses less healthy, its responses more feeble?

Such are the efforts of the naval engineers to-day, and the propaganda finds its legitimate result among engineers afloat. They are encouraged by their seniors ashore to think that Congress will embody their views in legislation. These views are vague. They have never definitely formulated them nor explained them. They want "authority to command and discipline their men." They already have more than they exercise. The principal interference with the engineer's force is rendered necessary to carry out "command and discipline" vested by regulation in their hands, but neglected or evaded.

Their social position, like that of the line and other branches, is based on a commission in the United States navy, and beyond that is precisely what each individual makes for himself. They enter the navy for certain duties, and they bear titles which indicate those duties. They may consider line titles as of more prestige and more desirable; but the organization of a great service cannot be overturned to suit the vanity of individuals.

Engineer-in-Chief Melville's word picture of the fireman in time of action is very striking, and will, I think, prove to be absolutely true. The fireman will face the red-hot furnace, will perspire freely, and wear little clothing, while he shovels in the coal which gives out the power to drive the great machine of destruction. The Chief will stand by the throttle ready to "hold her nozzle agin the bank," and his assistants will be at their sta-

tions to assist him and die for their country if necessary. They will do all this because it is their duty to do it, because they are trained to do it, and are paid to do it. Each at his station, and all behind eighteen inches of side armor and below a protective deck, they will wait for something to happen on the decks above them. If a shot should by any chance get through the armor and enter the boiler, would a line title for the chief engineer help matters? Surely no. He is doing an engineer's work. It is cut out for him and for his men, and they will, no doubt, perform it faithfully until death or the end of the fight gives them rest. He stands ready to receive and obey the captain's signal, and must obey it implicitly, blindly. The discretion is not his, nor the decision, but simply the execution.

What of the other hundreds on board? Where are they, and how do their billets compare with that of the man before the roaring furnace? What of the man behind the roaring gun? And what of the men in the thirty-six magazines? I have been led to think very seriously of these things during the past six months, and it seems to me that the man below and behind armor will be very fortunate in the supreme hour of a battleship's existence. There will be that above which tries men's nerve as well as their endurance. Carnage, the wreck of superstructure, splintered boats, fallen funnels, dismounted guns, will test the temper and quality of the "man behind the gun" and of the officer who commands him. The captain in the conning tower (perhaps not the one that took the ship into action, but a lieutenant or possibly an ensign) will have before his eyes this scene of destruction, and before his mind the picture of his vast responsibility. Throughout the action it is his province to decide upon the employment of each weapon, to determine when his 12,000 tons shall be sent crashing into the side of his enemy. Even at the moment of ramming, when the engines are doing all the work, the chief engineer has neither initiative nor discretion. He obeys a signal then as at all other times. Is there, then, any comparison between the duties of a chief engineer and those of a captain? between the position of a fireman and that of a sailor? Is this an "engineer's ship"?

The highly educated engineer, the man who is capable of designing and constructing machinery, is too much of a luxury for ship's rough work. What we need for engine-room watch stand-

ing is a class of practical men trained in machine shops and engine-rooms—such men as might be recruited from the various ship yards where they have made and put together the engines and boilers over which they would stand watch; and from the merchant service, where they have learned to drive machinery to make dollars and cents for their owners.

If the educated engineers are to stand watch, there are too few of them. If they are to supervise only, one in a ship, and machinists are to stand watch, there are too many of them. In my opinion their number should be reduced, and we should take into the service a corps of warranted machinists. The permanent position and good pay would attract the best men of a most desirable and efficient class.

R. D. EVANS.

IV.

Two ideas are assiduously advanced by the naval engineers: first, that they are the sole inheritors afloat of the genius of Watt and his fellow pioneers in modern science and mechanism, the sole representatives in the navy of the progress and development of this age of steel and steam; second, that "engineering" and "engine-driving" are one and the same thing, demand the same education and accomplishment, and merit the same recognition and reward.

Naval conditions have wholly changed within the experience of men still in active service. Steam, forty years ago an auxiliary, has now become the sole motive power, sails have been wholly discarded, and vessels of war are filled with machinery to steer, to hoist, to handle guns, to obtain efficient ventilation and drainage, all of which is operated directly or indirectly by steam. The domain of mechanics in a modern fleet is a wide one; the value of mechanical knowledge is almost universal.

In this naval renaissance line officers have borne their full share both in design and execution. Carrying from Annapolis a polytechnic training, long anticipating the new departure, they met more than half way the changes demanded by the new order of things, and quickly placed themselves in entire accord with its most advanced requirements. Their stake was greater than that of the engineers, for they command the country's ships and fleets, and would be held responsible for their operations in war.

Under their sole direction and guidance has been developed the manufacture of steel, urged on by an ascending scale of requirements to the highest results, the manufacture of armor which has led the world, all ordnance and torpedo engineering, electric engineering in its application to ship's lighting, searchlights and motors on shipboard, and the complicated systems of interior communications; and they have shared with the constructors the responsibility for the ventilation of ships. The gun shop at the Washington Navy Yard, which has not its superior, perhaps not its equal, in the world, is entirely their creation. A line officer has invented the range finder, the stadimeter and a variety of electrical appliances with which our vessels are fitted. In the new battle-ships the engineers receive directions by an electric telegraph, and the number of revolutions of their engines is transmitted by an electric indicator, both of which are the inventions of a "sailor" officer.

The engineers have been fully occupied in keeping up with the times in their own especial province.

The crucial experience of modern naval development, as marked from time to time by naval battles, has not altered in any respect the relation of the seaman to the men and forces under his control. Lissa did not differ from Trafalgar, nor the Yalu from Lissa. The actions of the Civil War, whether between sailing vessels, Mississippi steamers or monitors, were all the same in their military character. The seaman has always been in supreme command, and has employed at his own sole discretion every force and factor in his ship. The engineer has never yet become of prime importance; nor does history offer any expectation that he will.

The second point indicated above is the difference between an engineer and an engine-driver. A confusion of ideas in this respect is maintained throughout the articles to which this paper replies. The engineer and engine-driver are made to appear one and the same person, the liberal profession and the trade one and the same occupation.

Engineering is a great profession, liberal and comprehensive. It has directed the industrial development of modern times, and mechanical engineering, as one of its branches, shares its fame. But this high professional work ceases when design and construction are completed. The finished product is then handed over to

another occupation ; to men skilled by daily practice in its employment and care.

An engineer may go to sea in charge of engines, but while so engaged he is an engine-driver. This continually happens in our own navy. Highly educated young men are taken into the service as assistant engineers and are sent to sea to do the duty elsewhere performed by men who are qualified only for engine driving. Month after month, and cruise after cruise, their regular routine duty is work nowhere else given to men of their intellectual and professional position and attainments. Naturally they feel this disparity between the purpose for which they have been prepared and that for which they are employed, and this feeling finds issue in discontent and agitation.

On shore their duties are professional. They fully appreciate this difference. Engineer-in-Chief Melville said himself, not long since, with respect to one of his assistants, who, his term of shore duty having expired, was about to be ordered to sea : "He is worth $20,000 a year to the government as a designer ; and he is to be sent to a ship to become a mere engine driver."

The functions and positions of engineers and engine drivers (mechanicians) should not be confused. The navy in commission and ready for service—the military marine—has to do only with the second class.

Of these an ample number is needed in a modern fleet. In vessels filled with mechanism there must be a sufficient staff skilled in its care and use. No one of the many machines upon which the efficiency of a ship more or less depends may be allowed to suffer through neglect or ignorance. Upon this point there is no difference of opinion ; and the remaining question is, of what class shall the great body of these mechanicians be composed ? Engineer-in-Chief Melville and his friends insist that they shall be university men fully educated for engineering. Line officers hold that they should be practical artisans, trained in machine shops and engine-rooms, with muscles hardened by actual manual labor, and habituated to the exposure and fatigue incidental to their duties. They maintain that mechanical experience is a better preparation for these duties than college classes and lecture-rooms.

The view of the naval engineers is supported only by their theories and assertions. The contrary view is sustained by the experience and practice of the great navies, and of the merchant

marine. The tendency has been in navies to decrease the number of commissioned engineers and improve their professional acquirement; to increase the number of mechanicians and give them the permanent and assured status of warrant rank.

The number of commissioned engineers in the United States navy is already greater per ship and per horse power than in any navy of Europe. The Squire-Wilson bill would make it more than twice as great.

The following table shows the proportion in the several great navies:

	Number of engineers per ship.	Horse power to each engineer.
Great Britain	2.15	2,220
France	1.38	2,783
Russia	1.79	2,334
Italy	2.16	2,180
Germany	.96	3,920
United States	2.70	1,569
United States (proposed by Squire-Wilson bill).	4.21	1,004

Torpedo-boats are not included in the number of ships. Of these, Great Britain has 166, France 234, Russia 173, Italy 179, Germany 145, and the United States 18, including all authorized.

It will be noticed that Germany has less than one commissioned engineer to each vessel of her fleet. The German navy is noted for its active, hardworking, and progressive qualities. It is not hampered by traditions, because it is a young navy and has none. It receives the personal attention of a young, vigorous, and warlike emperor, counting his brother among its superior officers, and the sole criteria of its administration are efficiency and economy. Nor does any nation test so frequently or so stringently by mobilization and manœuvres the actual condition of its military services as does Germany, or apply so relentlessly needed measures of reform.

But with this small body of commissioned engineers is associated in foreign navies a large body of trained and skilled practical mechanicians. In continental navies these have existed from the introduction of steam. The following table shows the great change which has taken place in the British navy in this respect, especially in the last few years.

Since 1889 the British navy has been enormously increased. Two great building programmes have authorized 173 ships, many of them of unusual power and size. Its fighting strength

has been doubled, and its administration, training, and methods have been much improved.

ENGINEER OFFICERS AND ARTIFICERS (MECHANICIANS) IN BRITISH NAVY, 1863 TO 1896.

	Engineer officers.	Engine-room artificers.
1863	1,418	none
1868	1,265	90
1874	965	209
1877	898	393
1880	790	573
1883	691	788
1886	676	1,124
1888	687	1,163
1893	741*	1,541
1894	782*	1,898
1895	831*	2,068
1896	845*	2,335

*These numbers include about 70 engineers carried for "other service" and not "available for sea."

To what extent have the commissioned engineers shared in this movement? With an increase in the total *personnel* of 50 per cent., and of the engine-room artificers of 108 per cent., the number of engineers has been increased only 24 per cent. It does not appear that in the British navy the engineer is yet considered "the great factor in naval warfare."

Our engineers cite their great numbers during the war as an argument for increase. On January 1, 1865, they numbered 2,252, but only half were commissioned officers, 1,125 being third assistants with the rank of midshipman, and receiving a pay less than that of warrant officer. Of the 1,127 commissioned, 734 had the lowest rank, the relative rank of ensign. The body of volunteers (1,778 of this 2,252) were practical machinists, taken for the most part from the engine-rooms of merchant craft, and returning at the close of the war to their former occupation.

The importance of having in a fleet a certain number of highly educated engineers of commissioned rank is not denied; but they should serve afloat for the general superintendence and control of the engineers' divisions, and not for the performance of routine and subordinate duty. The educated engineer's breadth of mind, his rank, and the official status which it gives him, better qualify him for administrative direction—for the position of chief engineer—but it does not follow that his subordinates should be men of the same class. The naval experience of the present day, after ample service with mastless ships, sums up about as follows: Torpedo-boats and small craft require no commissioned engineers;

gun vessels and small cruisers require one; battleships and other heavy vessels two, a chief and an assistant; flagships perhaps three, to provide for chance vacancies. All watch standing should be done by mechanicians, brought into the service if possible as boys, trained in shops and engine-rooms, and advanced through the several grades of petty officer to the rank of warrant officer like our boatswains and gunners, with good pay, assured position, and the privileges of retirement.

Such a reorganization of the naval engineers would obviate a feature to which the attention of the country is periodically called by paragraphs in the papers from Maine to California, viz.: their physical breakdown on shipboard, which is constantly advanced as an argument for more rank and greater numbers. Many engineers have broken down; so have people in other walks of life. It is one of the ills of the flesh. Line officers break down; but these incidents are not employed in a propaganda.

The trouble lies with the men, not with the conditions of service. Many of the chief engineers of the navy are advanced in life and have led during long intervals between cruises sedentary lives on shore. They are too old—some of them sixty years of age; they are unfamiliar with the more recent machinery, and they can't stand the strain. The younger men who collapse simply lack the requisite physical strength. Men advanced in years are not fit to go to sea in positions of physical and mental stress. Remove the older engineers from the sea-going list, advance the younger men to the positions of chief engineers of our large ships, put a good class of warranted mechanicians into engine-rooms—brawny, vigorous young men, sound in wind and limb—and there will be no more "breaking down." We hear that the "Indiana," after a week's cruising at ten knots, sent her chief engineer and one assistant to the hospital. How absurd! What do the practical men who run Cramp's speed trials think of that? The "Indiana's" engine-room at ten knots would be a playground to them. What are we to expect in time of war from men who break down during drills?

The *personnel* of this, as of other branches of the navy, must be adapted to the actual conditions of its service. These are arduous and exhausting; and given a good practical knowledge of machinery, they demand as a first requisite physical endurance. Good lungs, heart, stomach, and muscular development

are necessary to withstand the heat and confinement, the coal dust, and oil spray in the machinery spaces of a modern man-of-war. Where shall we obtain this class of men? Certainly among those who have made such work their vocation, and who are therein a survival of the fittest, the physically incompetent having been eliminated. Certainly not from college graduates without knowledge or experience of the work, or of shipboard life.

Running through the papers in the May number is a distinct note of opposition to military discipline—of protest against authority—which is worthy of attention. The engineer is commended for "attempting to use industrial methods" in ships of war and for opposing "military routine." But, while contending against the requirements of discipline and military organization, the naval engineers ask for themselves more rank and purely military titles; and insist that a military status is essential to their efficiency. In brief, we take from their own statements the conflicting opinions that in a military marine the engineers are essentially a military body, and that their status, their rank, and their titles must be made so; and finally that their methods should be "industrial" and that "military routine" should be abolished from the firerooms.

It is fitting that the close to these arguments should be made by a gentleman who finds the position of a naval line officer the same as that of a mate in a merchant vessel, who finds that "sailors" have dealt long enough with naval regulations, and who has decided that Congress shall, upon this point, register the decrees of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, which organization, after coming into touch with the Naval Engineers, "now realizes the power which it possesses."

S. A. STAUNTON.

SOME MEMORIES OF LINCOLN.

BY EX-SENATOR JAMES F. WILSON.

THE raid made by the Confederate General, J. E. B. Stuart, in June, 1862, around the Union army commanded by General McClellan, caused great anxiety in Washington. One of its results was the interruption of communications between the capital and the Army of the Potomac. What this portended no one could affirm. That it suggested the gravest possibilities was felt by all. President Lincoln was profoundly disturbed and greatly depressed, as were all about him. Every person was anxious for news from the army, though each feared its coming; for it was expected to herald disaster.

While this feeling was dominating all circles several gentlemen, myself among them, called on President Lincoln in order to be definitely advised about the condition of affairs as understood by him. We were admitted to his presence at once. Upon entering the room where he received us, we discerned that he regarded the situation as of the gravest import. Intense anxiety was written in every line of his troubled face.

To our question: "Mr. President, have you any news from the army?" he sadly replied: "Not one word; we can get no communication with it. I do not know that we have an army; it may have been destroyed or captured, though I cannot so believe, for it was a splendid army. But the most I can do now is to hope that serious disaster has not befallen it."

This led to a somewhat protracted conversation relative to the general condition of our affairs. It was useless to talk about the Army of the Potomac; for we knew nothing concerning its condition or position at that moment. The conversation therefore took a wide range and touched upon the subject of slavery, about which much was said. The proposition was advanced that

the nation should take immediate and resolute ground for its utter extinction from the limits of the republic. The emancipation proclamation of the President was heartily commended; but it was insisted that the proclamation did not meet the full requirements of the case, and could not be made to answer the demands of the aroused moral sense of the nation, and that, therefore, the President, Congress, and the loyal States should act together for the extermination of slavery.

The President did not participate in this conversation. He was an attentive listener, but gave no sign of approval or disapproval of the views which were expressed. At length one of the active participants remarked:

"Slavery must be stricken down wherever it exists in this country. It is right that it should be. It is a crime against justice and humanity. We have tolerated it too long. It brought this war upon us. I believe that Providence is not unmindful of the struggle in which this nation is engaged. If we do not do right I believe God will let us go our own way to our ruin. But, if we do right, I believe He will lead us safely out of this wilderness, crown our arms with victory, and restore our now dissevered Union."

I observed President Lincoln closely while this earnest opinion and expression of religious faith was being uttered. I saw that it affected him deeply, and anticipated, from the play of his features and the sparkle of his eyes, that he would not let the occasion pass without making some definite response to it. I was not mistaken. Mr. Lincoln had been sitting in his chair, in a kind of weary and despondent attitude while the conversation progressed. At the conclusion of the remarks I have quoted, he at once arose and stood at his extreme height. Pausing a moment, his right arm outstretched towards the gentleman who had just ceased speaking, his face aglow like the face of a prophet, Mr. Lincoln gave deliberate and emphatic utterance to the religious faith which sustained him in the great trial to which he and the country were subjected. He said:

"My faith is greater than yours. I not only believe that Providence is not unmindful of the struggle in which this nation is engaged; that if we do not do right God will let us go our own way to our ruin; and that if we do right He will lead us safely out of this wilderness, crown our arms with victory, and

restore our dissevered union, as you have expressed your belief; but I also believe that He will compel us to do right in order that He may do these things, not so much because we desire them as that they accord with His plans of dealing with this nation, in the midst of which He means to establish Justice. I think He means that we shall do more than we have yet done in furtherance of His plans, and He will open the way for our doing it. I have felt His hand upon me in great trials and submitted to His guidance, and I trust that as He shall further open the way I will be ready to walk therein, relying on His help and trusting in His goodness and wisdom."

The manner of this delivery was most impressive, and as Mr. Lincoln resumed his seat he seemed to have recovered from the dejection so apparent when we entered the room. With a reassured tone and manner, he remarked:

"The Army of the Potomac is necessary to our success; and though the case at this moment looks dark, I can but hope and believe that we will soon have news from it relieving our present anxiety. Sometimes it seems necessary that we should be confronted with perils which threaten us with disaster in order that we may not get puffed up and forget Him who has much work for us yet to do. I hope our present case is no more than this, and that a bright morning will follow the dark hour that now fills us with alarm. Indeed, my faith tells me it will be so."

During the day advices were received from the army and soon thereafter the aspect of our military affairs gave renewed hope that the portent of disaster would be dispelled by substantial success. This was realized in the battle of Malvern Hill. And on the first day of the next session of Congress a movement was started which culminated in the amendment of the Constitution whereby slavery was abolished.

President Lincoln's profound respect for the Constitution of his country was made manifest on many occasions and in many ways. He had a lively regard for the rights of the citizen under it. I doubt if he performed any act as President which gave him more serious concern than did the one by which he suspended the writ of *habeas corpus*. This act interfered with the personal liberty of the citizen, and prevented his resort to courts for protection. I had numerous conversations with the President on this subject. He was sensitive under the criticisms to which his act suspending

the great writ was subjected. During a conversation had with him near the close of the year 1863, I became advised of the depth of his feeling in this regard. As we were proceeding, he put to me, with some abruptness, this interrogative statement:

"I suppose you have read some of my official papers?"

"Mr. President," I replied, "I believe that I have read all of your official papers that have been made public."

"Well," he responded, "that is more than I should have expected of any one; for I guess some of them were hardly worth the reading, though I meant each one should be; but as I have so much to think about and do, I would be more than mortal to think well and do well on all occasions and subjects. But, as you say you have read all of my published official papers, tell me frankly which one you regard most favorably."

My answer was ready, and I gave it in these words: "Mr. President, your letter of the 13th of June last, in reply to the one signed by Erastus Corning and others, whereby they communicated t you the resolutions of the Albany meeting relative to the arrest of Mr. Vallandigham is, in my judgment, your best paper."

Without allowing me opportunity to explain the grounds on which I based my opinion, he, with some indication of gratification, remarked:

"I am glad you think so, and I agree with you. I put that paper together in less time than any other one of like importance ever prepared by me."

He then explained how the paper had been prepared. Turning to a drawer in the desk at which he was sitting and pulling it partly out, he said:

"When it became necessary for me to write that letter, I had it nearly all in there," pointing to the drawer, "but it was in disconnected thoughts, which I had jotted down from time to time on separate scraps of paper. I had been worried a good deal by what had been said in the newspapers and in Congress about my suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and the co-called arbitrary arrests that had followed. I did not doubt my power to suspend the writ, nor the necessity which demanded its exercise. But I was criticised harshly, and sometimes by men from whom I expected more generous treatment, and who ought to have known more and better than the character of their expressions indicated. This caused me to examine and re-examine the sub-

ject. I gave it a great deal of thought; I examined and studied it from every side; indeed, it was seemingly present with me continually. Often an idea about it would occur to me which seemed to have force and make perfect answer to some of the things that were said and written about my actions. I never let one of those ideas escape me, but wrote it on a scrap of paper and put it in that drawer. In that way I saved my best thoughts on the subject, and, you know, such things often come in a kind of intuitive way more clearly than if one were to sit down and deliberately reason them out.

"To save the results of such mental action is true intellectual economy. It not only saves time and labor, but also the very best material the mind can supply for unexpected emergencies. Of course, in this instance, I had to arrange the material at hand, and adapt it to the particular case presented. But that was an easy task compared with what immediate original composition of such a paper would have been. I am satisfied with the result, and am content to abide the judgment of the future on that paper, and of my action on the great subject and grave question to which it relates. Many persons have expressed to me the opinion you have of that paper, and I am pleased to know that the present judgment of thoughtful men about it is so generally in accord with what I believe the future will, without serious division, pronounce concerning it. I know that I acted with great deliberation and on my conscience when I suspended the writ of *habeas corpus*. It was with great reluctance that I came to recognize the necessity which demanded it. But when that became plain to my mind I did not hesitate to do my duty. I have had to do many unpleasant things since the country imposed on me the task of administering the government, and I will continue to do them when they come in the line of my official duty, always with prayerful care, and without stopping to consider what personal result may come to me."

President Lincoln's solicitude for the welfare of the private soldiers of the Union Army was always active. Many facts illustrative of this have been given publicity. He did not lack appreciation of the necessity of discipline; but he recognized the difficulty attending the application of the rigid rules and regulations that had been formulated for the government of the regular army to the masses of men suddenly called from the freedom of

civil life into the military service. Hence the many instances in which he interposed his power to save private soldiers from penalties imposed by military tribunals.

Once I had occasion to apply for the removal of a charge of desertion which stood against a private soldier on the rolls of his company and regiment. The soldier had left his command, and visited his home in the State of Iowa, on sick furlough. He did not return to his company for several weeks after his furlough had expired. The cause of delay was continued sickness. Knowing the consequences that would follow upon absence after such expiration without proper explanation, the soldier had endeavored to keep his officers informed of his condition and of his inability to return. This he did by forwarding each week a surgeon's certificate of his continuing disability. As soon as he became able to travel he left his home, and, without further delay, rejoined his company and reported for duty. He was surprised to find that he was borne on the rolls as a deserter. The surgeon's certificates which he had obtained and forwarded had failed to reach the proper officer, and he technically was a deserter; nevertheless, he was allowed to go on duty. He at once prepared in writing a statement of his case, which he sent to his father, with a request that it be placed in my hands for presentation to the Secretary of War with a view to the removal of the charge of desertion. The soldier's father and myself lived in the same town, and our residences were but a few steps apart. Hence, inasmuch as I was at home during the time covered by the soldier's furlough, his detention by sickness after its expiration, and his return to his company, and as I frequently visited in his father's family during that period, I had personal knowledge of the facts in his case.

Soon after the papers had been placed in my possession, I proceeded to Washington, to be present at the opening of a session of Congress, then near at hand. One of the first duties to which I gave attention after my arrival at the capital was the presentation of the case of the son of my neighbor to the Secretary of War. I called on Secretary Stanton at the War Department. I found him very busy and in one of his bad moods. His office was full of senators, representatives, and other persons having business to transact with him. His manner was brusque to some, and not very courteous to any on that occasion. I had often seen him in such moods, and

considering the character of his duties, the multiplied cares that crowded upon him, and the condition of our military affairs, I rather wondered that he ever appeared other than he seemed that morning.

After disposing of the visitors who had precedence of me, he addressed me, and in response I briefly stated the cause of my visit, and reached the papers in the case to him. With an abrupt motion of his hand he declined to receive them ; and with nervous irritability said :

"Ah, this is the case of a deserter, is it ? I want nothing to do with it. We are having too many of them now. We had better make a few examples by shooting a deserter now and then. That might put a stop to the business."

To this outburst of feeling I answered : "Mr. Secretary, this is not the case of a deserter, except in the narrowest and most technical sense."

"That is what they all say," he replied. "Every man of them, when caught, or in hiding and asking for relief, has some plausible excuse. I have no time to spare for the consideration of the cases of men who run away from their duty."

My response was : "Mr. Secretary, I have personal knowledge of the facts presented in this case, and I tell you that it is a proper one for you to heed and remedy. Doubtless, some bad cases come to you for relief ; but this is not one of that kind. I know its character and present it to you on the basis of my personal knowledge."

The statement made no impression on him, and, turning from me, he was about to give his attention to others in waiting, when I remarked :

"Mr. Secretary, you are hasty and unjust. This case cannot be brushed aside in that way ; I know its merits, and will carry it to the President, who is deliberate and just, and I will get his order directing you to amend the record and place this soldier right on the rolls."

With more than usual emphasis, and with apparent irritation, he said :

"Go to the President, if you please ; I will not consider the case, nor will I execute such an order."

In the act of turning away from the vexed Secretary, I remarked :

"Yes, I will go to the President, state the case to him, and request him to read these papers. There can be no doubt as to the result. He will make the proper order and deal justly by the soldier. But he shall not do it without first having been told all that has passed between us; for he shall not be misled, nor act without knowledge of each and every feature of the case."

Proceeding at once to the Executive Mansion, I placed the papers in the hands of the President. He read them, and said:

"If the statements herein made are true, this soldier ought to be relieved; for he is in no proper sense a deserter. He seems to have done all that he could do to comply with the regulations governing such cases, and to discharge his duty. Are you sure that the facts are correctly stated?"

To this question my answer was: "I have personal knowledge that all of the material facts are true as stated in the papers you have read"; and I explained the sources of my knowledge.

The President handed me the papers, requesting me to endorse on them the statement I had made, which I did; and, after signing my name to it, I handed the papers back to him. He was proceeding to endorse the proper order on them, when I requested him to stay his hand for a moment that he might be placed in possession of some further facts connected with the case. He complied with the request, and I gave him a circumstantial statement of my interview with the Secretary of War. It seemed to interest him. At its conclusion he made no remark, but endorsed and signed the order as requested. He then returned the papers to me, quaintly remarking:

"Your persistence in this case is right. There is the order, and I guess it will be obeyed."

I thanked the President, and was about to depart, when it occurred to me that another question and answer might be of some service. I asked him what I should do in case the Secretary of War should decline to execute the order. He promptly replied:

"Report the fact to me, but I guess he will obey that order. I know it is a small thing, as some would look at it, as it only relates to a private soldier, and we have hundreds of thousands of them. But the way to have good soldiers is to treat them rightly. At all events that is my order in this case. Let me know what comes of it."

The result of this interview was promptly reported to the Sec-

retary of War. The papers were placed before him and his attention directed to the endorsement of the President. He read it and evidently was vexed, for with a noticeable degree of feeling he repeated the declaration that he would not execute the order. A circumstantial statement was then made to him of the interview with the President, nothing being omitted. This did not seem to affect the Secretary nor move him to compliance. After waiting a moment, and seeing no indication of action on his part, I picked up the papers, remarking as I did so :

"Mr. Secretary, as you decline to obey the President's order to you, I will obey the one he gave to me, and report the result of this interview to him at once."

Leaving the Secretary's room I proceeded down the stairway leading to the first floor of the Department, intending to go directly to the Executive Mansion with my report of the foregoing interview and ascertain the further purpose of the President. Before I reached the outer door of the Department a messenger overtook me and said the Secretary desired to see me. Returning to his room I found him apparently in better mood and his manner greatly changed. He pleasantly requested me to give him the papers in the case, and I passed them to him. Without further remark he endorsed on them directions to the Adjutant-General to execute the President's order. This done he turned to me and said :

"It seems to me that the President would rather have a fuss with anybody than miss a chance to do a kindness to a private soldier. But I suppose this case is all right. At all events I like your dogged persistence in it, and we will be good friends."

And so we ever after were.

Other matters caused me to call on the President some days after this occurrence. At the conclusion of our conversation relative to the object of my visit, he said :

"How did you get on with the Secretary of War in that soldier's case you had here the other day ?"

I reported the interview and stated the result.

"Well," he replied, "I am glad you stuck to it, and that it ended as it did ; for I meant it should so end if I had to give it personal attention. A private soldier has as much right to justice as a Major-General."

James F. Wilson.

PENAL COLONIES—AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL.

BY MAJOR ARTHUR GRIFFITHS, HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTOR OF PRISONS.

SOCIETY has fought with many weapons in its ceaseless warfare with those forces of rebellion and disorder that constantly oppose and break the laws made for the general good. The battle is not always to the strong, and that society has so far gained no decisive victory is seen in the continued vitality of crime. No penal system as yet devised has succeeded wholly. Extirpation, the oldest, the shortest, and simplest method with offenders, no doubt reduced their numbers by summary process. To catch your criminal and hang him out of hand was to rid the world of a rascal, to save the state the cost of his keep, and the public from his further attacks. But even when the hangman was busiest other candidates offered themselves freely. The same idea, that of removal, in a less permanent fashion, underlay deportation to a distance or transportation beyond the seas, a system that had much to recommend it. It avoided the savage truculence of a code that sent sinners straight out of the world with all their imperfections thick upon them ; it relieved the metropole or mother country of its worst citizens, but gave them the chances of rehabilitation in new lands when their offence was purged. Its seeming excellence even now recommends it to some European nations slow to accept the experience of others who have made the largest experiments with it, and have yet condemned and abandoned it utterly. When increasing tenderness for life forbade wholesale executions, when penal exile failed, became impossible, or was only persisted in with doubt and difficulty by those most enamoured of it, judicial ingenuity could devise nothing

better than imprisonment under new and improved conditions. Loss of liberty, detention, under certain irksome restraints, became the principal and most approved panacea for crime.

While all civilized countries generally have accepted the principle of cellular separation, some still dislike it, others have been deterred by various causes from its complete adoption ; two only have given it thorough and unstinting support, and these, too, in varying degrees. Great Britain and Belgium have alone and long since provided a single cell for every criminal held in custody and have applied the regime of separate imprisonment, wholly or in part, to all. The prison system differs largely, however, in the two countries. In Belgium the rule of strict separation has been imposed rigorously and for lengthened periods, for ten or more years. Great Britain has never practised the same severity either as regards discipline or term. The outside limit of separate confinement has been fixed at two years, and this is but rarely inflicted. The great bulk of British offenders progress through several stages of penal treatment, and the first part only of a long sentence or the whole sentence, if it be brief, is passed in the separate cell.

Both the British and Belgian systems must be allowed to have accomplished much, if only it be conceded that they have contributed to the diminution of crime. Some say that no prison system can exercise great effect in this direction; that when such desirable results have been attained they are due to other extraneous but concurrent causes ; that our extensive child rescue, the reformation of juveniles, the milder methods of the conditional or deferred sentence, contribute greatly to the comparative emptiness of prisons. It is impossible, however, to ignore such figures as the criminal statistics of both these countries can show. Thus in Belgium the total number of convictions fell from 7,000 in 1850 to 4,634 in 1889, although the general population of the country had increased from four and one-half millions to six millions between those years. In Great Britain the decrease has been still more remarkable. Taking the numbers actually in custody, the total of convicts, or those under sentence of penal servitude, was 11,600 in 1869, and in 1896 no more than 4,159 ; while the total in custody, taking the daily average of those sentenced to imprisonment, was reduced from 21,000 in 1878 to 14,394 in 1896. The increase of general population has, more-

over, been very considerable. In 1869 it was twenty-one millions, in 1879 twenty-four and one-half millions, in 1895, the last census, it had risen to thirty millions.

Obviously, then, the system of cellular confinement is not to be lightly condemned. Yet there is a strong current of opinion running counter to it, especially in its most severe methods. Its opponents use very strong and emphatic language against it. Enrico Ferri, one of the most gifted members of the now famous new school of Italian criminalists, stigmatizes the craze for the prison cell as "one of the madnesses of the nineteenth century." He admits that it originated in an intelligible reaction; that it was a proper protest against the moral and physical putrefaction engendered in the old gaols; but these are no longer existent, they can now be avoided without maintaining "the stupid, useless, costly process of consigning offenders to a living tomb." There is nothing new in these severe strictures. Many profound thinkers and practised administrators have already raised their powerful voices against the system. Thus Herbert Spencer has given it as his opinion that, "while silence and solitude may cow the spirit or undermine the energies, they cannot produce true reformation. . . . Indeed we think that it is probable that much of the apparent success of long cellular imprisonment is due to an enfeeblement which incapacitates for crime as much as for industry." Another, a veteran administrator of world-wide reputation, Sir Edmund Du Cane, has declared against it for long terms. "Perpetual seclusion in a cell for long years," he says, "with no communication with his fellows, is an artificial state of existence so absolutely opposed to that which nature points out as the condition of mental, moral, and physical health, and so entirely unlike that which a man is to be prepared to follow on his discharge from prison, that it cannot be expected to fulfill the required object."

Quite recently a powerful voice has been raised against it from within its chief stronghold. M. Prins, the new head of the Belgian prison department, has pronounced definitely against the system elaborated at such cost and with such pains in his country. M. Prins will not admit its efficacy for reformation. However excellent the theory, it has proved, he declares, an illusion in practice. It has been hoped that the criminal would be cured by withdrawing him from all noxious influences and subjecting him

to the benevolent admonition of prison pastors and masters. The prison staff, the chaplain, governor, warders, teachers, by constant visitation are to be his only companions, and they are to be concentrated upon him for his regeneration. Yet this process, he urges, soon dwindles into a matter of mere routine: if carried out in the ideal way it would be necessary to supply each individual prisoner with at least half a dozen competent preachers; as it is, one warder alone has to deal with some thirty prisoners, and the superior officials can give no inmate more than five or ten minutes a day. This is far from the "great moral hospital" which was in the minds of those most eager in support of the system. "To soak a human brute with good counsel," says M. Prins, summing up the situation, "and suppose that he will leave his cell regenerated, or that he can be safely let loose upon society, is a Utopia compared with which the dreams af More and Campanella are practical measures."

There can be little doubt that although it still finds some earnest champions, as in France, the system for long periods stands generally condemned. Nevertheless, for short terms it will not be lightly surrendered, nor in phases preparatory to more practical treatment. As regards the first, its infliction cannot be called unduly severe and may, perchance, be productive of good. Relegation to the prison cell, moreover, commends itself to many, as the simplest and most convenient method of coercion. It is so easy to say "three days," or, "a week's hard labor," and thus wash your hands for the time being of an offender. Whether the penalty will greatly benefit those subjected to it by its deterrence, or the opportunity it affords him for repentance, will not greatly concern the court. The main object of punishment, its sole excuse as some pretend, is that it tends to the prevention and cure of crime by these very means, of salutary warning and reformatory processes. That the short term effects neither is shown by the interminable procession passing in and out of gaol. Within the narrow limits that we agree to impose it, it fails whether as prophylactic or cure. It neither corrects the corrigible nor keeps the incorrigible out of harm's way.

It is on these grounds, no less than the more sentimental and academic, that cellular imprisonment of any kind fails to find favor. It is indefensible for long, ineffective for short periods. In the latter form we may hold to it still, and for distinct cate-

gories, but otherwise it must go by the board. The objections to life in common, even to the extent of daily labor, as a treatment for first offenders, are logical and sound. No tyro in crime should be subjected to the corrupting influences whether by precept or example of the hardened evil-doer. Indiscriminate association is to be strongly deprecated in such cases, for it is intolerable that the prison should be a school of crime. Whether a short incarceration will hereafter keep even the first and minor offender straight, whether by the recollection of discomforts endured or the moral regeneration worked upon him, may be doubted. The action of the penal law upon all such has been compared by M. Prins to that of a waterspout which lets fall drop after drop upon criminality, and which might as well be wasted in the sand. There is no reformation, says Ferri, to be secured in this way: "You cannot cure crime by quickly passing those who commit it through a gaol."

But where cellular confinement principally fails, whether for long or short periods, is with the habitual offender, the man who has taken up crime as a profession and who persistently relapses when at large. It is quite futile to subject him to short doses of cellular treatment. Nothing else, it is urged, will check or deter him. Can it be pretended that he is frightened by a punishment he is willing to face again and again? Hardly; still less is he cured by it with all its well-meant machinery for reform. Short sentences are simply wasted on him; they leave him where they found him and that is incorrigible. This is a conclusion forced on us by the irresistible logic of facts; one that must some day be accepted by all. We shall have arrived then at indefinite detention as the only possible or successful treatment. The common enemy when caught must be kept for much longer terms, under an indeterminate sentence, although not necessarily forever. Here, again, the cellular system fails us, being inapplicable for long terms and for the reasons already given. Philanthropic people regard it with too much distrust; the practical are alive to its shortcomings. It is disappointing, barren of results and when pushed to its farthest limits is positively cruel.

We are thus brought to admit the necessity for change; we must invent some new methods—some new sort of penitentiary establishments. They are not—or ought not to be—far to seek, and they should be found in the adaptation or extensions of exist-

ing institutions. The best solution of the problem is the penal colony, planned and governed on broad intelligent lines—the best part, in fact, of the progressive system, as it is called, but greatly enlarged and improved. The worst feature of cellular imprisonment would then disappear; life in association under proper restrictions would replace the separate cell, and if the suggestion tends to alarm those to whom "association" in any shape is a perpetual bugbear, they may be reassured on hearing that it would not be permitted with the first or minor offenders, the comparatively undegenerate tyros in crime. My arguments and recommendations apply only to the habitual criminal, who is presumably case-hardened or steeped already in corruption. He and his fellows have been so inoculated with the criminal virus that they can hardly take a disseminate infection.

The penal colony again should help to solve other difficulties, to remove other defects inherent in the cellular system. It must not, and need not, be so extravagantly costly. It is not surprising that nowadays, when the system is so gravely challenged, many governments should shrink from the expenditure of hundreds of millions of pounds sterling to provide cells for its hundreds of thousands of prisoners. No such outlay would be required to properly house the inmates of a penal colony; not only would the cost of installation and maintenance be less, but better returns might be expected from the labor employed. The greater freedom of action allowed would afford many new outlets of employment, more profitable, more useful in the public sense, less open to contentious objections, than the naturally limited work that can be carried out in a small, separate cell. The latter must, of course, be sedentary; the narrow round of handicrafts pursued singly, costly to teach, needing skilled instructors, with much wastage of tools and material in maiden efforts, and at the end the protest of outsiders complaining, not strangely, although often unreasonably, against the unfair competition of state-aided trade. Let it be once granted that those whose labor is held forfeit may labor in the open under freer conditions, and most of these objections disappear. There are many, almost boundless, opportunities for utilizing the means thus afforded, and in ways that offend no prejudices and threaten no interests. The experiment of the penal colony has been tried in some countries already, under its own name or in princi-

ple, although not so called, and I now propose to give some account of those in existence.

It must, however, be premised that the word "colony" is used in a restricted sense—that of its original meaning as a place worked by husbandmen, planted out, but at no great distance, nor beyond sea. I have no thought of proposing a return to deportation or transportation, whereof the advantages are highly problematical and the converse sufficiently clear. The arguments against it are too well known to need restatement in full. The theory of transforming the criminal into a landed proprietor is very fascinating, but it has failed in practice. After costing many millions, the penal colony passes into the stage where free settlers no longer need the assistance of convict labor, and contest the rights of emancipated convicts to concessions of land. The free settlers, as M. Joly, an eminent Frenchman, has said, are "at first in sympathy, then indifferent, then hostile." When they are few they willingly accept the help of penal colonization, when many and prosperous, they reject it. "Transportation," says Prins, "can never constitute a regular permanent part of any scheme of penitentiary institutions. It is not, and can never be, more than a passing or empirical practice; . . . the day when free emigration begins, transportation is doomed." This was the experience in Australia; it is fast showing itself in New Caledonia, and we shall see it some day in Eastern Siberia. If convict labor is worth anything, it is worth keeping at home, to be used for the benefit, direct or indirect, of the taxpayer who bears the charges. It *is* worth something, a good deal indeed, if properly applied, as it can be, and may be, under enlightened administration and with all the checks and safeguards afforded by watchful public opinion, conditions never present in a remote dependency. The penal colony of the future is to be established in our midst and in full view of all.

Several European nations, Japan also, have tried this form of penal treatment and with considerable success. In Holland, after the establishment of the famous pauper colonies at Frederiksoord and Willemsoord, a purely penal colony was created at Ommerschans to take refractory free colonists. This institution has now been closed in a great measure, because Holland has declared for the cellular system. France is now seemingly so wedded to its ideas of far colonial penal establishments that it has neglected

the counsels of an eminent publicist, M. Berenger, who nearly fifty years ago urged that France everywhere offered vast opportunities for the better utilization of penal labor than that practised within prison walls. "The *landes* of Bordeaux cry aloud to be reclaimed; the marshes of Corsica are only waiting to be drained." In the early days of the Second Empire an energetic administrator, M. Thuillier, devoted himself to the latter enterprise, and created penal colonies around Ajaccio at Chiavari and Castelluccio, also at Casabianda, south of Bastia, intended to reclaim and cultivate waste lands. These colonies were sadly crippled by insanitary conditions, which were, however, presently overcome, and considerable progress has been made. It is strange that the nation which produced such noble characters as the Abbé Rey, MM. de Metz and Charles Lucas, the founders of the famous agricultural reformatories of Oullins, Mettray Val d'Yèvre, Citeaux, and Sainte Foy should not have adopted the principle of the penal colony near at hand. France now prefers to follow out the cellular system to the bitter end, or to travel into the *impasse* that deportation will certainly bring her. It will be noted with interest that at a recent meeting of that most useful body, the Prison Society of Paris, when discussing the question of penal colonization, a suggestion was made to adopt a system of *sections mobiles*, of "movable prisons," that is to say, prisons of light and temporary construction that can be established on one site and easily moved to another on the completion of any particular undertaking. The possible application of this most useful system nearer home does not appear to have struck, or at any rate to have laid hold of, French administrators.

Yet it has been practised with excellent results in Austria-Hungary. Large parties of prisoners who were approaching release have been employed in a state of semi-liberty in executing works of great public urgency and utility. Just ten years ago a strong detachment left the prison at Laibach to improve the bed of the river Lessachbach in Upper Carinthia; other parties have worked upon roads, canals, and rivers in the provinces of Carniola, Styria, and Gallicia. The reformatory prison of Aszod was constructed by this means. One of the most useful exploits of the Hungarian prisoners was to hem in the turbulent waters of the Galza, a torrential river which made great havoc in flood time. The river could be curbed only during the summer, when low,

and then harvesting fully employed free labor. The work was accordingly entrusted to parties of convicts from the nearest prisons, who completed it most satisfactorily in three years. In all these cases perfect order was preserved; there was no elaborate prison paraphernalia; the prisoners carried with them a portable shed barrack, or built huts, or lived under canvas, always without bolts and bars or any of the restraints hitherto deemed indispensable when dealing with offenders in custody. "The labor they performed was cheap and effective; the discipline maintained excellent, and the prisoners are said to have benefited morally and physically, the first by the trust reposed in them, the second by the healthfulness of their daily occupations."

This is the very simplest realization of the penal colony. Indeed, it may be doubted whether it should ever be carried much further. At any rate, the more limited scope of the establishment encourages a closer supervision than would be possible with great numbers. And that the supreme head should be in touch with all the component parts, that he should know something of the character of every individual so as to watch him at every turn, is essential to good government, the best safeguard against trouble and disturbance. Misconduct never grows to a dangerous head, extending from one discontented man to many, if it be early checked by a judicious authority. This is really moral discipline, the best and safest, and where it exists it goes farther than a crowd of warders and an armory of weapons. Austrian experience proves that it can be attained; so does our English, of which more directly.

Again, the movable prisons would cease to be such if constituted on too large a scale. The *déménagement* would be too serious an undertaking, even though the buildings and plant employed were of the simplest description. But this power of easy transference is also an essential condition. Only thus could the labor available be usefully directed on the works that offered. We have seen in the case of Austria-Hungary what works could be undertaken. In every country, new and old, there are similar outlets to be found for prisoners' labor; the prosecution of works for the general good, but for which funds are not otherwise available. Prisoners must be supported and maintained, anyway; it is right to use their services in a remunerative fashion.

Nevertheless, the larger and more permanent penal colony is

to be recommended where wider and more prolonged operations were possible—such employments as the clearing of forests, the reclamation of fore-shores and waste lands, the construction of sea breakwaters and river dams, quarrying, mining, the cultivation of the soil with all varieties of farming and husbandry, the raising of stock, cereals, fruit, vegetables, and so forth. No European country has done more than Italy on these larger lines. Out-of-door agricultural labor has long been a part of prison discipline in Italy, but only in recent years have penal colonies of serious proportions been planted in the islands close at hand in the Tuscan Archipelago. The three principal ones are on Pianosa, Gorgona, and Capraia ; there is a smaller colony on the island of Monte Cristo, immortalized by Alexandre Dumas, and, lastly, a large and increasing establishment at Castiadas, a mountainous district on the island of Sardinia. A vast amount of good work has been done at these during the last decade ; the colonies are mainly self-supporting ; they grow their own corn, make their own clothes and administer generally to their own needs as regards buildings, roads, and communications, the manufacture of agricultural implements and machinery. Other important and profitable results have been obtained, the colonies can boast of vineyards producing excellent wine, rich olive groves, good cereal crops ; at Castiadas, which employs a boat of its own for shipment of provisions, the stock raising has been most successful, and herds of cattle, sheep, and goats are to be met with on its extensive pasture lands, all of them tended by convict herdsmen who live a free life far away from the prison.

If we go to the farthest East, we shall find the penal colony in full use by that most enlightened and progressive nation, Japan. She employs large numbers of convicts in useful works such as road making, mining and land reclamation. Three great establishments exist at Sapparo, Kabato, and Sarachi. At the first there are some 2,000 inmates, convicts undergoing a minimum sentence of ten years, who work the neighboring mines of Paronai, cultivate the prison fields, and supply all services with forges, brick-fields, and various industrial manufactures. The mildest discipline is enforced. There is no work except in fine weather ; wet days are rest days. The prisoners occupy plain, unpretentious buildings and are lodged at night in rooms like wooden cages, 40 in each. They enjoy semi-liberty ; the usual

accompaniments of a gaol, great gates, high walls, bolts and bars, are wanting; the only precaution against escape is a distinctive salmon-colored costume and a peculiar way of shaving the crown of the head. A well-considered system of gradation in condition is an incentive to industry and good conduct; with each "badge" gained, the convict obtains privileges, and those who wear five badges are sent off into the interior in small batches, where they are like free laborers. This system is one of considerable antiquity in Japan, and much valuable work has been accomplished by it. After the expiration of sentence, grants of land are given to each convict, in the district of Hokkaido; he holds the land from government, but is to all intents and purposes a free man.

In Great Britain the home penal colony has long been accepted in principle, not quite intentionally perhaps, nor as fully as may yet be the rule, but the Public Works prisons, the second phase of our convict system, are practically penal colonies. Their discipline may be too rigid and severe for exact imitation, and yet it is through that discipline that so much has been accomplished. When large numbers of convicts are seen quietly and industriously performing their daily tasks in land reclamation and other forms of agriculture far beyond the prison boundary walls, indeed a couple of miles or more from home, and this with no display of force, no chains, or other restraints than the vigilance of a warder or two, it must be clear that the initial bugbear of the open-air employment of convicts has been removed. There are precautions, of course; an outer cordon of armed sentries; constant visitation of superior officials; a well-perfected system for intercommunication and reinforcement in case of alarm or escape, but these are by no means prominent. Yet in late years they have been so effective that no disturbances, no escapes, have occurred at Dartmoor. It may be urged that on that far off moorland the mere isolation is a sufficient safeguard. Obviously the converse holds true, and dangerous combinations might reasonably be feared among reckless men so far removed from the busy centres of life. But experience has negatived such apprehensions. Again at Borstal, near Chatham, where a large force of convicts are engaged in the construction of forts for the defence of the Medway, the work is carried on at a still greater distance from the prison than at Dartmoor. A line of railway with guarded

trains conveys the convicts to points three and four miles away, where they labor at large, only checked and controlled by a cordon of sentries and a very perfect system of signalling. Perhaps the nearest approach to the *sections mobiles* already mentioned was tried at this very place, Borstal, in the preliminary stages of building the main prison. Parties of convicts were driven over daily from the neighboring large establishment of Chatham, five or six miles distant; they travelled in ordinary vans, under proper escort of course; but they were in a state of semi-freedom, very much as in the Austrian method, and they gave no trouble. The same system was practised in another enterprise, the construction of large powder magazines at Chattenden, also near Chatham, but not very many miles.

There is surely enough in these various experiments to encourage imitation on a wider scale. Countries seeking to reform, or, at least, to alter their penitentiary system, might adopt the principle of the penal colony with advantage on account of its greater utility, economy, and humanity, and more especially with regard to the substantial results it would attain both in protecting society and reforming offenders.

ARTHUR GRIFFITHS.

AMERICAN BICYCLES IN ENGLAND.

BY GEORGE F. PARKER, UNITED STATES CONSUL, BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND.

THE relation between the bicycle industries of England and the United States has always been close, in spite of the fact that, in the beginning, it was one of almost absolute dependence on our part. Until recently American ingenuity has not been devoted, in any large degree, to the making of devices for the promotion of sport. Our artisans, having been too busy developing the necessary to give much time to the superflous, had few incentives to invent new devices or to make improvements upon the general principle of a two-wheeled machine for human locomotion.

The seat of the English bicycle industry has always been in Birmingham, and the towns in its neighborhood, thus practically concentrating the whole of the export trade into the Birmingham consular district, which includes the whole or part of twelve or fifteen counties in the heart of England. It was here that weldless steel tubes were first drawn and made a commercial product. This is an industry in which Americans were for a long time backward ; manufacturers in other lines of the metal trade assuring me, during visits they made here in 1893 and 1894, that weldless steel tubes could not be made with profit in the Unites States. So the trade here was able to perfect safety cycles, and they were shipped to the United States in such numbers for several years that the makers came to look upon America as their principal outside market.

The value of machines sent from here from 1890, by which time the movement had gained enough headway to cause a separate classification, until 1893, was as follows: 1890, $324,961.07 ; 1891, $621,664.99 ; 1892, $761,352.95 ; 1893, $613,247.73. As an effect

of the trade depression in the United States in 1893, the exports rapidly declined. When business revived, our manufacturers were well prepared for it and the demand for cycles was so successfully filled at home, that, up to the end of the second quarter of this year, not a single complete bicycle had been sent for many months through the Birmingham Consulate.

But it is the experience of this very busy district that one thing goes out and another comes in, a fact well proven by the growth of the weldless steel tube export. In 1894 this only amounted to $85,899.55. During 1895 it rose at a bound to $507,041.29, and during the first quarter of 1896 it reached $231,200.36. This movement was the result of unusual foresight on the part of the American bicycle-makers. They entered into such large contracts for Birmingham tubes that they really monopolized the product before the English bicycle manufacturers knew what had happened. Then two movements developed simultaneously. The English bicycle-makers must needs have tubes or they could not make machines, while American tube-makers saw a chance to supply their own market with these necessary materials.

In England the formation of tube and bicycle companies has been the distinctive industrial movement of the year. Men who had been makers on a small scale saw an opportunity to become, all at once, large makers of a product for which there was a general demand. Hence, small shops were enlarged; tool and machinery makers were put to work, and promoters found it profitable to float new limited liability companies. So strong was this movement that thirty-two of these were formed during the first six months of this year with a combined capital of nearly $55,000,000. Scarcely a week has passed since the first of July without a new company, so that the number for the year promises to be not less than fifty. The speculative value of the shares of the large concerns seems to be justified by the dividends, either declared or promised, upon the first half-year's working. Some of the profits reported have been enormous, but the opinion is general that they cannot continue for another full year. It is thus impossible to separate the speculative from the investment element. So many are interested in maintaining the prices of shares that all naturally want to put off the day when the decline shall begin. The large companies in existence before this move-

ment began have shared in this speculative advance. Some of them had gone through a good many vicissitudes, but they seem to have so prospered under the influence of the general movement as to have become profitable concerns.

In the meantime the development of tube-making in the United States has been so rapid that shipments during the second quarter of this year dropped nearly one-half, to $130,253.84, and are still going down so rapidly that they promise within another year to reach almost the vanishing point. It is not necessary for me, at this distance, to tell progressive readers in the United States how the tube industry has developed there. But it is not less well known here in every establishment in which cycles or their component parts are made. Indeed, it is anticipated that tubes will be imported here next year from the United States for use in making cycles.

Except in the case of limited liability companies—most of which are too new to have made reports—it is far more difficult to get anything like complete returns of the number of employees and the extent of output than with us. The publicity incident to business is less, and trade jealousies are many fold stronger. It is estimated that there are in Birmingham about one hundred and fifty factories connected with the cycle trade in its various branches, with about fifteen hundred or eighteen hundred employees. In Coventry, which still remains the principal centre for complete machines, there are more than a hundred firms with about seventeen hundred employees. Wolverhampton, whose businesss has suffered during recent years, has found something of a revival through this trade, while several other less important "Black Country" towns have some machinery devoted to the making of cycle parts. All these are in the one consular district, within the limits of which fully 80 or 90 per cent. of all the cycles made in the United Kingdom are produced.

It is calculated that the output for the home trade will be about 750,000 cycles this year, valued at £11,000,000 or £12,000,000. The foreign trade also shows a substantial increase; the exports for 1895 being £1,393,810, against £1,200,913 for 1894. No comparative treasury returns later than the first quarter of 1896 are now available. Then the exports were valued at £444,509, against £329,096, in the corresponding quarter of 1895, and £329,535 for the same time in 1894. As to capital invested, the

returns are quite as vague and are mainly estimates. According to these the limited companies engaged in the industry had a capital of about £6,000,000 at the end of last year; since which time similar companies have been floated with a capital roughly put down at £11,000,000, total of more than £17,000,000. When to this is added the large investment of private capital, it is probably within the mark to say that about £20,000,000, or nearly $100,000,000, has been invested in this industry. Its wide distribution was shown in a report made a few days ago by the Earl of Warwick, when, presiding over the statutory meeting of a new limited company, he stated that while the plant and fixtures were formerly owned by three men, the new shares were distributed among more than 4,000 separate holders. Nearly 2,000 patents were applied for last year for improvements and additions to cycles in their various branches. What proportion of these were issued to American inventors is not noted in the published returns.

The new element in the British cycle trade is American competition. This was entirely unlooked for, and at first the tendency to belittle it was apparent. The publication of the returns of the Treasury Department showing that from 12,000 to 15,000 high-priced machines of American manufacture had been offered in this market within a few months, coupled with the prediction that not less than 40,000 or 50,000 high-class machines would be imported next season, opened the eyes of many people. The presence of aggressive agents of American manufacturers in many of the larger towns, together with the competition of a number of expert riders in exhibitions and parades, have combined to remove a good deal of skepticism. Altogether, makers and the public now concede that American machines are likely to be an important factor even in the trade of the coming year, and to have a decided influence on prices and production if the demand for cycles continues here and grows in other parts of the world.

A word of advice to our manufacturers and dealers who hope to find a market here for some part of their product may not be amiss. The first caution I would give is concerning quality. There is a demand here, as everywhere else, for good wheels, at lower prices. The opinion is general that present prices for first-class machines are excessive, and that if the demand continues

they must be reduced. Discounts to the trade have been reduced, causing many complaints, and being, in reality, an advance upon former prices. All this tempts both domestic and foreign manufacturers to cheapen products, so that they may meet the views of thousands of people, who, without money to waste, are still anxious to have good machines. This makes it imperative for our manufacturers not only to allow no deterioration in the quality of machines offered here, but that they should, if possible, give more value for the money here than at home. The reason for this is obvious. When a mechanical product is offered in a foreign market, and especially among a watchful and intelligent people like those of England, who resent such a competition in their own markets, the reputation of the exporting country is more at stake than that of the individual manufacturer. A hundred bad machines sent by one maker, remote from the known and recognized centres of commerce, might easily stop the sale of 10,000 machines made under the best and most careful systems in the largest factories in the United States, while a dozen shipments of this kind might ruin a promising trade. Anything like a sudden cheapening of prices would look suspicious, and be accepted as a lowering of quality. After our own people, none in the world are more willing to pay a reasonable profit upon an article for personal use than those of England, and as there are already too many machines here of the cheap and nasty order to warrant competition in this kind of product, it is to be hoped for the good name of our manufacturers and the country, that there will be no attempt to enter upon it.

I am convinced that the field here for American cycles cannot be capable of indefinite expansion. This more than any other is distinctively a manufacturing country with unlimited capital and large experience in meeting competition. Business methods are slower than with us and so do not allow such rapid adjustment to new conditions. In some cases trade has been permitted to slip away; but they are now watchful of increasing competition on all sides and are studying the question in all its bearings, with more care than for many years. They will hold as much as possible of a business like this when it becomes a settled one. This will be when it is shown that the bicycle has come to stay and that its manufacture is an industry in which account may be taken of the same elements that enter into every other branch of trade.

In spite of this it is possible for our cycle-makers to find a good market here for some years for some proportion of their surplus product; and the important thing, it seems to me, is to use this opening for entrance into the larger and more important markets beyond. The people of the colonies are used to watch so closely for any signs in the mother country that probably the best recommendation for American cycles in Australia and South Africa would be the fact that they had made a place for themselves in England itself. I hope not only to see many thousands of American machines on the roads of England, but that this will enable our makers to send many more thousands into markets which they have not yet entered as serions competitors. This is not an unnatural course. Trade may first seek the most crowded marts and then, as it gains experience and clientage, make its way into others less crowded.

The most surprising element in this competition is that an enormous amount of American machinery and tools is already in use in cycle factories here. The tendency is to increase it, the admission being made everywhere, in the smaller as well as in the larger shops, that our machinery is better fitted for its work, and that its use insures a great saving of labor, as well as an improvement of the product in both quality and appearance. It matters little that some expert inquirers are asking what good result is to come from the heavy expenditure made for some years in establishing technical schools, if a country almost devoid of them is to demonstrate its superiority as a maker of tools. A great number of local bodies all over the kingdom have erected enormous buildings—the new one in Birmingham has cost nearly $400,000—have fitted them with every appliance for giving instruction in the trades of the district of which they are the centre, and have employed teachers and organized classes open to every apprentice and artisan at rates of tuition almost nominal. These have been the outgrowth of the recent competition from Germany, where technical schools are of long standing. It must be confessed that these institutions have been established in many places on a scale which, to a stranger, seems hardly to be justified by the use to which they are placed and the meagre results so far to be seen. I can but believe that our system of public free schools constitutes, after all, the best possible technical schools for a varied and complete industrial development.

I am sometimes asked by users of American machines to caution the manufacturer and inventor not to sacrifice strength to lightness in weight. It is represented, in explanation, that the roads in England, by the hardness of their foundation, indeed by their very superiority, are more trying on bicycles than our own, which have, in the main, a dirt foundation. I presume the American manufacturer, with his habit of studying with care the wants and conditions of a new market before he enters it, has taken all this into account, and that if he has not already learned the facts he will soon do so. But the inability of our carriage-builders to make headway here with light vehicles tends to confirm this impression, and so I repeat it for what it may be worth.

On one subject I can speak with some authority, owing to the efforts I have made since this movement started to assist our manufacturers with suggestions. This is the matter of agencies for the sale of cycles. With us all sorts of these are found in every city, town, and village. This justifies the manufacturer at home in asking his consul at a given point to send him the names of men who might handle his machines. It seems to me, however, that there is only one safe way for large producers, and that is to establish their own agencies, choosing with care the men to be entrusted with the work. As a rule, the English maker does this, and all who seek to compete with him may well learn as early as possible that they must do the same thing if they expect to make headway. When small concerns seek to make sales here, several might combine for the purpose. The few agents found here usually represent certain makers, and accept other machines as a sort of incident to their business. As they push this one, which may have a considerable reputation, all others must take care of themselves. Every American business man will know what this means in a country far distant from the place of production, the very name of which may be unfamiliar to the purchaser. Several companies have already seen the difficulties, and, having sent their own agents, are pushing their business in accepted American fashion.

One other matter seems to me important. The wheels of most American machines offered here are made with wooden rims, which are thus far unfamiliar to the British market. Aside from the question as to their adaptability to the damp, muggy

climate, there are peculiarities of structure not possessed by the ordinary machine of English build. It seems to me, then, that the important thing is to have repair shops in centres like London, Bristol, Birmingham, Manchester, Bradford, Sheffield, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dublin, and Belfast. These need not be maintained by each company, but for the repair of American machines in general. They need not be large, but should be in the hands of efficient and practised workmen, who, being paid American wages, will know how to deal fairly with the great number of cycles for which our makers expect to find a sale here. Perhaps, as the use of our machinery is extended on this side, the necessity for this may disappear. The British workman can be absolutely depended on not to deal maliciously with an outside machine, but the conditions under which he works are so different from those in the shops where such cycles were made that he necessarily lacks knowledge or skill for dealing with them. The adoption of this suggestion would, I think, overcome some difficulties, and by reassuring the buyer on the point of convenience, price, and quality would enable many an agent to make a sale which would otherwise be difficult or impossible.

It is certainly creditable to the genius and adaptability of our people that they have taken up a new industry with such energy and success as to cut off all foreign trade in the completed product, and then in one of the principal articles entering into it, and that, within a few years, they should engage in competition with the foreigner in his own market and sell more machines in England, in the face of the severest competition from every quarter, than the English makers, with the whole supply in their hands, ever sold in the American market within the same length of time. It is much that in the year 1896, in addition to filling the home demand, our makers should send into the different countries of the world more than half the number of complete machines exported by British makers to the same markets during 1895. This having been done, it ought to be possible to supply the home demand and to sell to other peoples during the season of 1897 more machines than England, France, and Germany combined. An industry which can show such results as this within eleven years after its birth is entitled to be called a pretty lively infant.

GEORGE F. PARKER.

THE DUTY OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION.

BY THE HON. JAMES H. ECKELS, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

THE intimate relations existing in this country between business and politics have largely resulted from the changed conditions wrought by the war. The important legislation of the war period dealt with matters of tariff and currency; and in its character and aims tended to bring the action of the general government, as a determining factor of profit or loss, into each man's private undertakings. The tariff enactments directly affected the price of the manufactured product and of agricultural produce, while those upon the subject of banking, currency, and finance as markedly trenched upon matters which decided men in granting or withholding commercial credit. That presidential campaigns based upon questions of tariff and currency did not follow immediately upon the close of the war is not strange. These questions, of necessity, gave way to problems of governmental reconstruction of the Southern States, the rights to be accorded the freed slaves and the adjustment of the whole country to a new order of things. It thus came about that the campaign of 1868 was largely destitute of tariff and currency discussions, while that of 1872 was wholly given over to a contest upon lines designed to improve the civil service and raise the standard of official conduct. The nomination of Mr. Tilden, in 1876, was a victory for the advocates of a sound currency over the forces of fiatism in the Democratic party, and yet the contending parties fought out the contest almost entirely upon the issues of economy in public expenditures, the giving to the Southern States the right of local self-government, and the need of wholesome governmental reforms.

The promise of a distribution of office in accordance with the most radical "spoils" idea, and the introduction into each campaign of incitements to sectional animosities and war hatreds, gave to the people a kind of politics which, while indirectly affecting the interests of business, did not wholly unsettle them. The campaign of Mr. Tilden, if it failed to secure to him the office to which he was elected, was not without beneficial results to the people. It secured to the Southern States the right of local self-government, banished Federal troops from State legislative halls, eliminated appeals from the stump and through the press to feelings of sectionalism, and impressed upon the succeeding administration the need of retrenchment in national appropriations. It was not until the declaration in the Democratic platform of 1880 in favor of "a tariff for revenue only" that it was seen how deeply concerned, because of the war revenue legislation upon matters of taxation, were a large number of the business interests of the country in the conduct and outcome of a national election. Whether the tariff question was introduced for purposes of fright after the unexpected defeat in the State election in Maine in September of that year, or not, is immaterial. It did bring to public attention the fact that the effect of much of the past legislation had been to mix business and politics to such a degree that in future campaigns the condition of business must be seriously affected by the course of politics. In each succeeding presidential contest, with but a single exception, this has been made more patent. It was not manifest in 1884 only because the death of President Garfield, preceded by a long and bitter contest over the right of distribution of public patronage, coupled with the assaults upon the personal integrity of Mr. Blaine, introduced elements into the campaign which overshadowed all else. The campaigns of 1888 and 1892 were distinctively tariff ones. The manufacturer, the laborer, the agriculturist, and the consumer were all directly affected by the outcome of these campaigns, and compelled to readjust themselves to new conditions. The interest of all had been moulded in the largest measure by Congressional legislation; and, in consequence, the possibility of a change in the extent of legislative aid to be granted or withheld could not but cause business uncertainty, unwillingness to formulate new enterprises, and hesitancy about carrying out old ones.

Our tariff campaigns demonstrated the effect of the long and unnecessary continuance of unwise tax laws, until a point had been reached when it was unavoidable that the further maintenance of them should become a political issue and thereby cause a direct monetary loss to all the people. The currency campaign just ended bears with equal emphasis upon the same point, and from its inception to its close it has resulted in far greater business disaster. Just as the originating and the continuing of the protective enactments of the war found fruition in the political tariff agitations of 1888 and 1892, so did the passage of the Treasury currency act of 1861, with the kindred silver legislation of 1878 and 1890, culminate in the currency agitation we have so recently witnessed. The basic principle of the act of 1861 was governmental fiatism as applied to governmental currency issues, strengthened by attaching to them the legal-tender property. This was the principle also upon which the Bland-Allison act of 1878 rested, nor was it wanting in the Sherman silver act of 1890. It was manifestly the cornerstone of the doctrine of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, as its advocate has stated it in the past; and it must be his reliance in the future. The protective theory as applied to our tax laws, and the theory of fiatism as applied to our currency issues, have introduced into the citizens' private business the elements of legislative control to such an extent that injury instead of benefit has been the resultant effect. The business prosperity which is substantial and lasting excludes this factor of aid and control, just as a currency which is thoroughly sound must not depend upon legal sanction for any part of its value. As long as business prosperity is to be wrought or sought by law, the business world must be subject to the influence of the needs of party politics, the decrees of the political caucus, the demands of party leaders, and the whims of party law makers. Legislative control in the business world means, during each campaign, congressional and presidential, months of uncertainty, depression, and stagnation. It must entail hardship upon the laborer and loss upon the capitalist. Any temporary benefits which seem to flow from it are certain ultimately to be swallowed up in widespread disaster and ruin. It insures disturbance not in one or two but in innumerable interests which ought to be free to work out their own ends.

There could be no better time than the present for the busi-

ness interests of the country to be rid of the harm incident to presidential and congressional contests based upon suggested governmental interference in business matters. The verdict of the November election marks how strongly the voter stands in favor of the gold standard of value and how thoroughly he resents any attempt to debase the nation's currency and impair its credit. It is equally as emphatic in its declaration against the forces of society which make for disorder, discontent, and danger to American institutions. Because of this pronouncement—the decision of the citizenship of the country united in the desire to preserve the country's integrity, not of a party held together by the cohesive power of public patronage—there has come renewed hope and confidence to the business world. American credit is rehabilitated at home and abroad. On every hand money and the representatives of money are coming out of hoarding and seeking the active channels of commerce and trade. The capitalist is now willing to invest, not because a particular political organization has been successful at the polls, or a particular individual elected president, but because the electorate have decided the one issue in the campaign, *the money issue*, in accordance with principles of honesty, the facts of financial history, and the dictates of common sense.

These first evidences of improved conditions have been taken to mean an era of unexampled prosperity, but such a state will not necessarily follow. Only the first step, though it be a long one, in that direction has been taken. The others to follow, if less important, are nevertheless essential. The citizens who aided in defeating the proposition to have law-made money for the benefit of one citizen as against another must now join in preventing the law-making powers from attempting to create law-made wealth, and, in so doing, free the country of the source of both currency and tariff agitations.

If "the all-powerfulness of the law" is invoked in behalf of tariff agitation it will, with a show of justification, be sought as an aid to the agitation of the money question, and the fight for a dollar of value as against a dollar of fiat will have again to be waged, with attendant business derangement, want of employment for labor and curtailment of credit. If Congress will

now undertake only such tariff legislation as shall give an amount of revenue sufficient for the country's expenditures, remedying only patent defects in existing laws, and not attempt a general revision for protective purposes, there need be no realignment of contemplated business plans, nor any period of delay in the carrying out of those already matured. On the other hand, the following of a different course must throw the whole question back into the arena of polities to be debated, agitated and voted upon again. The country has passed through two complete tariff revisions within six years. It could hardly stand another, even were it in a thoroughly prosperous condition. It would be folly to undertake another now when it is so nearly exhausted.

The policy of placing the tariff laws of the country upon a true revenue basis would liberate the business man from governmental partnership and governmental control in his enterprises, and to this extent minimize the factors of uncertainty with which he must now deal. These factors can still further be reduced by the legislative branch of the government making such provision as will emphasize the voters' decision against any law-made money, whether it be of silver or of paper. The voter's act was not one of a merely negative character. He cannot wish to have it understood that he was simply voting against something. He at one and the same time both protested against false principles in monetary practice, and declared for that which is sound. His action can only be interpreted in the light of a demand for affirmative relief. This relief cannot be secured to him through legislative inaction. It is not enough that he is still to have the single gold standard of value, the right of private contract, and to be rid of the threatened danger of a debasement of the currency, whether brought about by attempted national or international bimetallism. He has had the gold standard for more than sixty years, enjoyed the right of private contract always and has never known in his country's history a single hour of practical bimetallism. The citizen ought now to have such laws enacted for him as will completely remove from him the danger of having his individual credit curtailed and his business ventures ruined by some act of his government in relation to the outstanding evidences of indebtedness which it has forced into circulation, which it never permanently

redeems, and cannot, under existing laws, cancel. The proper business of the government is not to issue instruments of credit and circulate the same as money. Its fiscal duties lie in the direction of collecting and disbursing revenues ; and whenever it undertakes to deal in evidences of debt, as a bank does, it inflicts loss upon the citizen, both in his capacity as a tax-payer and as a business man. Always at the time in the past when the business world has been threatened with trouble, the danger has been enhanced by the currency issues of the government. If, in normal times, the merchant or banker fails to notice their effect, that fact does not warrant their continuance, since it is evident that they are a cause of embarrassment in times of danger.

Here, then, is room for decisive affirmative relief. The payment, gradual retirement, and cancellation of the legal tenders and the authorizing of the banks, under governmental supervision, to issue the country's credit currency and redeem the same in gold, would be the crystallizing into a fact of the phrase "sound money." It is impossible entirely to rid the people of the notion that value can be created in silver and paper as long as those who protest against such a notion as absurd fail to do away with a currency which is so wholly dependant for support upon the promise of the law.

It is the fortune of the Republican party to have profited by the efforts of those, irrespective of past political affiliations, who, on November 3d, repudiated the doctrines of the fiatist, the Populist and the Socialist. If that party is sufficiently strong of purpose and courageous of action it will seize an opportunity such as is seldom vouchsafed to a political organization. It can entrench itself in power, evolve a thoroughly safe currency system, free the business world from unwise and unnecessary legislative interference and control, take the money and tariff questions out of politics, and hasten a long-continued period of prosperity which will come to all sections and to all citizens of the Republic. The victory gained was so little of a party victory that in matters of vital business legislation there can be no justification for a wish or a purpose to subserve party ends. The country certainly has a right to, and does, expect that everything shall be done that can be done to put an end to currency agitation and the growth of sentiments which tend to weaken the financial credit of the citizen and hinder him in his

daily business pursuits. The threatened renewal of the struggle for a debased coinage can only assume serious proportions through a failure to do the things which would assure the country's material advance. Heretofore the strength of the agitation for a cheapened monetary standard and a cheap currency has been derived from the concessions and compromises tendered to those urging on such agitation by those who disbelieved in the one and knew the evils of the other. To-day there is neither room nor justification for surrendering a single iota of the advantage gained. The issue was fairly made, fairly fought out, and the result was decisive. The responsibility has been placed, and if the campaign of 1900 is again a currency struggle, it will be because the managers of the Republican party either interpreted wrongly or executed weakly the purpose of those who entrusted them with power.

JAMES H. ECKELS.

HAS THE ELECTION SETTLED THE MONEY QUESTION?

BY THE HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

THE battle between bimetallism and the gold standard is on, and whether the campaign just closed proves to have been a decisive engagement or but a skirmish, it will stand out conspicuously in American history. On the third of November, 1896, the American people sat in judgment upon the greatest issue ever submitted to them in time of peace. Every one who studies the money question, either from the standpoint of those who desire bimetallism or from the standpoint of those who favor a gold standard, must recognize in it a question which transcends in importance any other economic question which can occupy the attention of the American people. When we determine the kind and quantity of money we determine the level of prices, and the level of prices concerns every family in the land. For the first time during this generation the money question has been the paramount issue of a political campaign. For twenty years past the financiers have succeeded in writing the financial plank for the conventions of the two leading parties and then have controlled the Presidential nominations. The platforms have generally been sufficiently ambiguous to bear a double construction, and the candidates have usually been known as "safe men," according to the definition given to that phrase on 'change. As a rule, the moneyed interests have looked after our financial policy, while the rest of the people have quarreled over the tariff. The Republican party met in convention last June and attempted to again give the tariff question pre-eminence, but when the Democratic, Populist, and Silver parties agreed in declaring for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without wait-

ing for the aid or consent of any other nation, the Republicans found it impossible to confine discussion to the tariff issue. In fact, the silver question soon absorbed public attention to such an extent that it became practically the sole political topic considered throughout the country. People discussed the present legal status of the silver dollar, the various laws affecting silver, the amount of production, the cost of production, etc., etc. To the world at large this nation presented the interesting and inspiring sight of seventy millions of people thinking out their own salvation. Men who had never spoken in public before became public speakers; mothers, wives, and daughters debated the relative merits of the single and the double standards; business partnerships were dissolved on account of political differences; bosom friends became estranged; families were divided—in fact we witnessed such activity of mind and stirring of heart as this nation has not witnessed before for thirty years. Foreign newspapers daily reported the progress of the campaign and students of political economy came from Europe to obtain a closer view of the struggle. It is probable that the money question has been studied within the last four months by more people than ever before in all the history of the world simultaneously engaged in its consideration. And what was the result of that study? Temporary defeat, but permanent gain for the cause of bimetallism. It is a significant fact that the silver sentiment was strongest where the question had been longest considered. In the West and South, where the people had been actively engaged in the discussion of bimetallism for several years, the majority favored the restoration of the money of the Constitution. In the Eastern States where, until recently, there was practically no general consideration of the money question, the gold sentiment was strongest. There, the people had, up to the opening of this campaign, heard only one side. In those States both parties were against free coinage; nearly all the leading newspapers were against it; the banking interests were against it; the corporations were against it; and it was also opposed by those influential members of society who live under the influence of the financial and corporate interests.

Until the Democratic National Convention adopted an emphatic declaration in favor of free coinage at 16 to 1, our side of the question had few defenders in the Eastern States. After the

convention adjourned, the Democratic party in the East was reorganized, new men were placed in control, and the work of education was commenced. The result, instead of being discouraging, is full of encouragement. When before has a great cause made such rapid progress in so short a time as bimetallism has made in the Eastern States? When has more real heroism been displayed than has been displayed there this year? If any one thinks that the fight for bimetallism is over, let him ask himself when a single defeat ever disheartened such men as those who have this year advocated free, unlimited, and independent coinage? When men's convictions are so strong that they will face political defeat without flinching, defy financial despotism, and risk social ostracism in behalf of a cause, they do not surrender because they lose one battle.

It must be remembered further that we fought against great odds in the Middle States also. The Democratic party in Wisconsin and Minnesota declared against silver in the conventions which sent delegates to Chicago. In Michigan the convention was nearly equally divided on the money question, and there was a bitter contest within the party in Iowa, Indiana, and Ohio. In Illinois we were at a great disadvantage because the influence of the Chicago press was thrown almost entirely against free coinage, and this influence pervaded nearly all the States of the Upper Mississippi Valley.

Throughout the entire Union the trusts, corporations, and banking interests were for the most part organized against silver, and these interests could act in concert on a moment's notice, while prompt co-operation was difficult, if not impossible, among the masses. The campaign did not afford sufficient time to bring clearly before the people an important truth which investigation must reveal, namely, that on the money question the interests of the money-owning classes are not identical with the interests of the wealth-producing classes. A dollar which increases in purchasing power is an advantage to those who trade in money and to those who hold fixed investments, but it is an injury to those who owe money and must purchase it with the proceeds of toil. It must be evident, therefore, that the people familiarly known as financiers cannot be trusted to frame a financial policy for the whole people unless they are entirely free from the selfishness which is generally supposed to be a well-nigh universal trait of

mankind. Money loaners have never been known to advocate laws reducing the legal rate of interest; why should they be expected to advocate a financial system which will stop the appreciation of money?

The advocates of free coinage have asserted that the gold standard is a conspiracy organized by the great financiers of the world to lessen the volume of the world's standard money for the double purpose, first, of raising the purchasing power of a given quantity of money, and, second, of making it easier to corner the supply of standard money. The advocates of free coinage believed the charge when they made it, and they believe it still. Inspired by the conviction that they are laboring in behalf of a large majority of the people, not only here, but throughout the world, they will continue their fight, confident that four more years of experience will convince many who have thus far resisted argument.

Some of our opponents, rejoicing in victory, are attempting to cry down any further consideration of the money question. They complain that agitation disturbs business, and they accuse the advocates of free coinage of stirring up discontent. The violent epithets used by some of the worshippers of gold recall the story of the London fish-wife who was remonstrated with for abusing an eel. She justified her language by saying that the eel would not keep still while she was skinning it. Those who suffer because of the gold standard can hardly be expected to keep quiet and look pleasant while the injury continues. Hard names do not relieve their sufferings. They too want confidence restored, but it must be a confidence that their condition will be improved—not that their lot will be made still harder.

Agitation is the only means by which wrong can be redressed under our form of government. The man who denounces agitation simply opposes the discussion of a public question, and the man who attempts to put a stop to the discussion of a public question confesses his hostility to our form of government. In a nation where the people govern, they must be free to consider any subject which concerns their welfare. Those who are disposed to suppress any further agitation upon the money question should remember that the opponents of bimetallism have always been ready to agitate whenever they desired to secure legislation. During his first administration, Mr. Cleveland recommended the

suspension of coinage under the Bland Act—those who supported him were not afraid of disturbing business then. During his second term he succeeded in securing the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Law—the Boards of Trade, the Chambers of Commerce, the financiers and the gold standard press did not hesitate to disturb business then. All legislation temporarily disturbs business to a greater or less extent, and yet the Democrats (the gold Democrats included) commenced agitating for the repeal of the McKinley Tariff Act as soon as it became a law, and the Republicans (the gold Republicans included) commenced agitating for the repeal of the Wilson Tariff Act as soon as it became a law. The New York Reform Club was organized for the purpose of agitation; it first agitated against the protective tariff and then against bimetallism. The Home Market Club was organized to carry on an agitation against tariff reform. I mention these instances to show that the people who now oppose agitation against the gold standard have always been willing to agitate when they were not satisfied with existing legislation.

Those who regard this election as a conclusive settlement of the question at issue should recall the recent political history of the United States. The exact vote cannot be given at the time this article is written, but it is so close that a change of less than thirty thousand votes, properly distributed over several States, would overcome the Republican majority in the electoral college. The vote was so nearly even in Kentucky, South Dakota, and Wyoming that a change of one thousand votes either way would change twenty electoral votes. On the basis of the electoral vote, therefore, there is nothing to guarantee permanence in the victory for the gold standard. But even if the Republican triumph was more sweeping than the figures at present indicate, it would not settle the next campaign. In the past, parties have often recovered quickly from what seemed overwhelming defeat. In 1872 Mr. Greeley was defeated, and yet in 1876 Mr. Tilden was believed by the Democrats to have been elected. Mr. Blaine was defeated in 1884, and yet Mr. Harrison was elected in 1888. The Republican victory of 1888 was quickly followed by the Democratic victory of 1890 and the election of President Cleveland two years later. The election of President Cleveland by a large majority in 1892 was followed two years later by an enormous

Republican victory. The changes which have taken place in the past indicate the possibilities of the future. There is only one prophecy which can be made with certainty of fulfilment, and that is, that the American people will study a subject until they understand it and will then settle it. Changes of opinion will go on until the best solution of every question is found. Our form of government is based upon the theory that the people are capable of self-government. This theory is, in my judgment, well founded. The people have both the intelligence and the patriotism to select and to secure for themselves those policies which are best. They are now engaged in an effort to discover and secure a satisfactory financial policy, and it would be a reflection upon them to say that they would permanently accept an unsatisfactory policy. Experience plays an important part in the settlement of public questions. That financial and industrial conditions are unsatisfactory at this time, no one denies. The advocates of free coinage have insisted that these conditions are largely due to the gold standard. They insist that falling prices are but an evidence that gold is rising, and they assert that the rise in the purchasing power of an ounce of gold is due to legislation which has increased the demand for gold. The Republicans, on the other hand, have blamed the Wilson bill for the present hard times and have promised to restore prosperity by opening the mills. The next four years will determine whether the Republican promises can be fulfilled.

In 1890, in a report which accompanied his tariff bill Mr. McKinley said: "That there is widespread depression in this industry (agriculture) to-day, cannot be doubted." This admission was made after the country had had thirty years of protective tariff. This depression in agriculture is more widespread and acute to-day than it was six years ago. In the same report Mr. McKinley said: "This great industry (agriculture) is foremost in magnitude and importance in our country. Its success and prosperity are vital to the nation. No prosperity is possible to other industries if agriculture languish." He was correct in asserting that prosperity must begin with the farm. The farmer has suffered because the price of agricultural products has fallen, while taxes, debts, and many other fixed charges have not fallen in the same proportion. His total income has decreased while his necessary expenditures have stubbornly refused to de-

crease, and he has been compelled to economize in his living expenses. The President-elect recognized this fact in 1890 because he said in the report above referred to: "We do not believe that our people, already suffering from low prices, can or will be satisfied with legislation which will result in lower prices." In the late campaign the laboring men have been told that low prices are an advantage to them, while the farmers have been pointed to the advantage of higher prices. It is going to be very difficult for the incoming administration to secure higher prices for the farmer and lower prices for the wage-earner. It must be remembered also that the financiers have denounced as dishonest any dollar which falls in purchasing power. Will the advocates of a gold standard try to raise prices and thus, according to their own language, become repudiators? Will they be willing to have debts paid with dollars which will buy less than the dollars borrowed? If, on the other hand, the maintenance of the gold standard results in a continuation of low prices, or, as bimetallists believe, in still lower prices, then the condition of the farmer will become worse than it has been in the years just past.

If our opponents imagine that the bimetallists will be easily defeated in 1900, let them remember that thousands of Republicans have been held to that party this year by the pledge that their party will try to secure international bimetallism. If the party did not intend this pledge to be relied upon, why was it inserted? If Republicans have relied upon it, will they not be disappointed when the four years pass without a successful effort to secure co-operation on the part of European nations? We have charged that international bimetallism was not seriously contemplated by those who wrote the Republican platform, and that the pledge was made to deceive the voters; the next few years will sustain or disprove our charge.

The gold standard Democrats cannot do as much harm in 1900 as they have done this year. At Chicago they advocated a financial plank almost identical with the one adopted by the Republicans. They declared that free coinage would interfere with international bimetallism, toward which, they added, all efforts should be directed. The fact that the gold Democrats, whose devotion to international bimetallism approached the pathetic so long as they were members of the Chicago Convention, forgot all about it when they reached Indianapolis, illustrates the lack of

candor which has all along characterized the advocates of the gold standard. During the last three months the gold Democrats have gone up and down the land loudly declaring their affection for Democratic principles, while they have striven to undo all that Jefferson and Jackson labored to accomplish; and in order to give a touch of humor to their campaign they prefixed the word "National" to the word "Democrat," although they neither expected nor desired their ticket to carry a single county in the entire nation. They used their party organization for the purpose of misleading others, while they themselves spared no effort to secure the success of the Republican ticket. They cannot disguise themselves again.

This year many employees were either directly or indirectly compelled to support the Republican ticket. To even a greater extent the creditor classes coerced the debtors. Coercion and intimidation will not be supported by public opinion. If the employer has a right to control the vote of his employee, then he should be made secure in that right by legislation which will prevent independence upon the part of the employee. If, on the other hand, the employer has no right to control the vote of his employee, then any attempt to do so must arouse public indignation. If the creditor has a right to control the vote of the debtor, then he, too, should be so protected by law that the debtor cannot evade him. If, on the other hand, he has no right to control the vote of the debtor, then any attempt to do so cannot be defended before the American people.

The contest for financial independence will go on. "An American financial policy for the American people" will still be the motto of those who have in this campaign advocated the free coinage of silver on equal terms with gold. We entered the contest with a disorganized army; we emerge from it a united and disciplined force without the loss of a soldier. We are ready for another contest. We shall watch legislation, discuss every movement made by the enemy and keep before the public the principles for which we contend. We believe that we are right, and, believing that right will finally triumph, we face the future firm in the belief that bimetallism will be restored.

W. J. BRYAN.

A PROBLEM OF ARIDITY.

BY C. M. HARGER.

THE West is harvesting the fruitage of the seed sown in the boom time of seven and eight years ago. The burdens entailed by that spasm of speculation upon the prairies have never ceased to trouble, but the time has come when they represent more than mere uneasiness in the management of debts. The situation constitutes a problem that calls for the most careful and skilful treatment in order that the investors, as well as the settlers who were so willing to bond themselves, may be protected. Thousands of investors are carrying over-due loans, wondering what to do—whether to bring suit for recovery or to credit the loss to "experience." On the other hand there are many Western communities that are embarrassed by the burden of indebtedness and taxation, and are as eager to discover a way out of their difficulties as are the people at the other end of the line. They find themselves without the means to meet the obligations which they incurred when it was supposed that every hamlet would be a city and every farm a town "addition." The problem is a serious one, and it is felt to be so in many a home where the savings of years are tied up in the investment "out West."

The decrease in values in the far West is almost inconceivable to one who has not been through the change from inflation to depression. Hundreds of prairie cities are finding their real estate almost unsalable. They were once so sure of being the centres of the business life for a large surrounding country that the fall is beyond their comprehension. A sale of the assets of a Central Kansas bank that failed in 1889 was held the other day, and many lots in Western town additions that had been a part of the bank's assets were sold to the highest bidder for thirty cents apiece. They had been appraised at $70 each when the

bank failed; but, as they were on the outskirts of a place that had lost its grip on prosperity, they had nothing to keep them above the level of farm land. Farms in the western part of Nebraska and Kansas are in the same condition. They are not salable except where they can be combined into large ranches, and where the owners are possessed of clear titles. Thousands of these are owned in the East under the deed of a sheriff, through the process of foreclosure. The loans that were made on them in the halcyon days are past due, and the mortgagees have taken their own.

What of the dwellers on these lands? They have gone. When the crops did not grow they packed up their belongings, mortgaged their claims to the limit, and started for that Mecca of the unsuccessful Westerner—"back East to the wife's folks." Here is the record of some of the counties in Western Kansas, showing the population in 1887 and in the present year:

	1887.	1896.
Clark	5,078	1,473
Comanche	5,004	1,200
Edwards	4,717	3,147
Ford	9,218	5,003
Grant	2,716	494
Gray	4,896	1,249
Greeley	4,646	852
Harper	17,655	9,235
Haskell	2,848	587
Hodgeman	4,589	1,860
Kearney	2,891	1,046
Lane	3,630	1,666
Meade	4,457	1,652
Morton	2,560	320
Ness	6,667	3,972
Pawnee	7,284	4,442
Scott	2,830	1,045
Seward	2,552	688
Stanton	2,864	471
Stevens	2,663	678
Wichita	2,627	1,432

This is a condition that tells its own story. It is eloquent of broken hopes and of longing that was unsatisfied. The traveller who drives over the plains sees the farms deserted and the sod-houses, looking like exaggerated prairie-dog huts, standing here and there, telling where some family tried to make a home and failed. The fields that were tilled while the rains came and afterward, as long as the settler could stay and live on hope, are degenerating to the old-time wildness. The hunters rejoice, for the game is coming back to the far Western plains.

This has all resulted, not from the lack of effort, but from the

fact that not enough water has fallen in the Western third of Kansas and Nebraska to make the crops grow. That is the whole matter. It is not bad judgment or politics that has driven these thousands out of the Eden that they had sought, but the failure of crops. Kansas has lost a quarter of a million in population in this way, and the fact has exerted a depressing influence on those who remain. It is the difference between the rising and the falling tide. The loss has occurred entirely in the Western counties, for the Eastern part of the State has in the past year gained 18,000 in population, while the State as a whole has gained only 1,900, although the births outnumbered the deaths by several thousands.

The people of the West are the bravest on earth in their fight to make homes and amass a competence, but they have to realize the situation. One city in Kansas has issued a circular, saying that the town is unable to pay its indebtedness and the valuation is decreasing at so rapid a rate that it will be necessary to have a concession from those who hold the bonds of the town, or to move out and start another city near by the site of the old one. The circular quotes figures to show the condition of the municipality, and it is not worse than that of many a town on the frontier. There are places where there is not a dweller in one-tenth of the houses, where the ten-thousand dollar schoolhouse is empty, the expensive city hall is without an inhabitant, and the double brick and frame stores are the shelter of the beasts of the plain. These are the towns out on the prairie where there should never have been a town.

Then there are counties where the people are at their wits' end to find a way out of the difficulty into which they have been led by the reckless manner in which they have voted bonds and adopted expensive customs and luxuries. One county in Kansas has issued a notice to its creditors. It says that the land is assessed for more than it is worth and that the people will not pay taxes on it. This year more than two-fifths of the county was sold for taxes as delinquent. There were nearly three thousand pieces of real estate put up at auction, while the tax rate is five per cent. on the valuation. This county frankly says that the only way out of its predicament is for the bondholders to consent that the debts shall be reduced and put at a point that can be reached by the people. This is another case where there has

been too extravagant living in the past; and the people are paying the penalty for it. The valuation in this county has fallen off $900,000 since 1888, and the population has fallen from 9,000 to 5,000. The circular, which is sent out by the County Commissioners, closes thus: "Our condition is this: more taxes, less value; less value, higher rates; higher rates, personal property leaves; personalty leaves, population goes; population gone, business stops; business stops, the land is yours and what will you do with it?"

This is the serious question that faces the semi-arid region of the West, and upon its answer depends the prosperity of thousands of brave men and women and their families. They have tried faithfully to make the life on the plains a success, and the result is not what they expected. But, on the other hand, the result to the investor has been disappointing. There is on his part a keen feeling that there has been mismanagement by the farmer—but he has not been out on the prairie. He has not seen the crops fail because of drought. He has not seen the clouds roll up in the northern sky at twilight, night after night, and then go back without the falling of a drop of the needed rain.

Much is hoped from irrigation, but that cannot do everything. The commission appointed by the State of Kansas to investigate the outlook for the irrigation interests has its report ready. It shows how the western third of the State has in some sections an abundance of water for the moistening of crops, but says that the farmers do not know how to use the supply. They are too eager to make a showing, and they will not irrigate a small area on which they could make a success, for they want to have a large quantity of land under ditch. One farmer confessed that he knew that he had water enough to irrigate only five acres, but he tried to wet ten. "I thought if I couldn't irrigate ten acres I wouldn't have any," was his answer to the inquiry as to his foolishness.

About 2,500 plants are in operation, however, in Kansas alone, and these are on the average furnishing the living of five persons each. This means that there are over 12,000 people provided for, and they can be depended upon not to ask for seed-wheat or to petition the Legislature for help. The leader of the commission, however, says that in his opinion the western part of the

State cannot be used for general agriculture, as that part of the State is more suitable for the stock-raiser and the ranchman. The farmers who are trying to live there by crop-raising alone must go. The man with the hoe is out of his element unless he can turn into the ditch plenty of water. This can be done only in circumscribed sections, but indeed the supply of moisture is not of the best anywhere. Up in the mountains and in the foothills they are taking the water for their great irrigation enterprises before it can reach the people of the plains.

So the investor is confronted by the peculiar condition of having his money tied up where he cannot get it, and where the security is not what he wants. The plan that has been proposed by the commissioners of some of the counties that are in debt, that the mortgagees be generous and scale down the indebtedness, and that the debtors then refund the amount and start over again, is in many cases the only way out of the situation, and the outlook is such that there seems to be profit in the project. The West must have this problem solved in some way before that part of it which lies on the eastern slope of the Rockies is to reach its full fruitage. There are no opportunities for the adoption of new laws that will make the settlement of this section more suitable to the nature of the climate. This was tried and the "timber culture" laws were adopted. The result is that here and there on the bleak plains are scanty growths of cottonwoods that have the appearance of being stunted in their birth, and are battling with the fierce winds as only the unnourished tree can battle. The climate which was to be changed by the trees has not changed, and the farmers, when they have obeyed the injunctions of the law, and secured a title to their claims, plow up the timber and put the land into kafir corn.

The western third of Kansas lost thirteeen thousand people last year; Nebraska's western third nearly as many, and thousands had gone before that. Those who remain recognize that there is before them a serious question. That is: Shall we try it again or go? If we try it again, upon what basis shall the trial be made? The old one of undiversified farming has failed. Debts have been assumed. Payment is due. How shall the new beginning be made? This is the problem of the West to-day.

CHARLES MOREAU HARGER.

OUR TRADE WITH SOUTH AMERICA.

BY THEODORE C. SEARCH, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS.

INTEREST in the development of foreign trade in American manufactures has been greatly stimulated during the past two years by the lessened demand for goods at home. Manufacturers have found the capacity of the home market insufficient to absorb their normal output, and the only avenue of relief has presented itself in an enlarged export trade. Concurrently with this diminished home demand has come a marked shrinkage in the prices of material and in wages, with a consequent reduction in the cost of manufacture. The result of these two conditions —need for new markets and ability to compete with foreign manufacturers—is manifest from the figures of the export trade of the United States for the year ended June 30, 1896. During that period the exports of American manufactured products exceeded by $45,000,000 the exports of similar goods for any other yearly period. The increase of exports from $183,595,743 worth of manufactured products in 1894–5 to $228,489,893 in 1895–6 is nearly double the gain in any previous year. With the exception of the period of the Civil War, when the lessened export of cotton increased the percentage of manufactured products in the total exports, the proportion of manufactures in the aggregate of the foreign sales of American goods never was so large as in the year just closed. In the twelve months ended June 30, 1896, 26.47 per cent. of the exports from the United States consisted of manufactured products, against 23.14 per cent. in 1894–5 and 21.14 per cent. in 1893–4.

It is evident from these statistics of our export trade during the fiscal year just ended, as well as from the heavy outward flow of goods from all our ports at the present time, that efforts to

secure footholds in foreign markets have been peculiarly aggressive during the past year. There is further evidence of this in the unusual number of American manufacturers who have spent the past summer abroad, not in pleasure, but in the pursuit of business. It was remarked a few weeks ago by the editor of one of the leading technical papers that nearly every prominent American maker of machine tools had been in Europe during the summer in quest of orders. I presume that there has been a proportionate activity in other branches of industry which are able to compete for foreign trade.

In all this aggressive movement to secure for the United States a larger share of the trade of the outer world, probably nothing has been so significant of the practical determination of American business men as the recent tour of investigation in South America by a commission representing the National Association of Manufacturers. A dozen representative manufacturers left their business for three months and journeyed 20,000 miles to study the conditions of trade in Brazil, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic, to find out the requirements of the markets of those countries and to ascertain the possibilities of a larger trade in American products. It is difficult to convey an adequate idea of the intense interest with which this mission was regarded in South America, and the powerful stimulus it has given to the consideration of all questions bearing upon the trade relations between the United States and the countries to the south of us The members of this party were received everywhere with overwhelming hospitality, and nothing was left undone by public officials and business men in Brazil, Uruguay and the Argentine to make completely successful and satisfactory the investigations undertaken by the committee. All this has directed public attention strongly toward South America as a possible market for greater quantities of American merchandise, and has created an eager demand for more information about South America and South American conditions and trade. What has been learned by this Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers will add much to the store of information of this character.

Consideration of the conditions and the possibilities of South American trade naturally resolves itself into a few practical questions concerning the extent of the foreign trade of the South American countries, the distribution of this trade among the

various nations, the share of the United States in this commerce and the means by which that share can be increased.

The aggregate trade of South America with Europe, England, and North America amounts to close upon $700,000,000 per annum. As some of the South American republics gather no complete statistics of imports and exports, and as the figures of others are defective, it is difficult to deal accurately with the foreign commerce of these countries. I have taken, therefore, as the basis for my statistical deductions, the figures compiled by the United States Treasury Department—evidently from the reports of various nations dealing with South America—and published in the *Monthly Summary* for April, 1896. From these figures I have made up the following table to show the trade of the principal nations with South America in 1894. Trade between the various South American countries, which forms a large total, is omitted in this statement.

TRADE OF THE PRINCIPAL NATIONS WITH SOUTH AMERICA, 1894.

(Imports from and Exports to South American Countries.)

Countries.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
Brazil	$157,979,961	$96,591,768	$254,571,729
Argentine	123,956,158	57,067,950	181,024,108
Chili	58,900,700	23,438,948	82,339,648
Venezuela	19,268,609	10,771,920	30,040,529
Colombia	14,600,982	14,665,159	29,266,141
Uruguay	12,721,118	15,071,901	27,793,019
Peru	20,335,197	5,611,094	25,946,291
Guianas	10,927,855	10,650,528	21,578,383
Ecuador	5,739,729	2,906,708	8,646,437
Other S. A. countries	5,769,151	2,978,626	8,747,777
Total	$430,199,460	$239,754,602	$669,954,062

Brazil and the Argentine Republic together transact two-thirds of the trade between South America and the principal nations, the proportion being about the same in the imports, exports, and total. Brazil furnishes at present by far the largest market in South America for European, British, and American goods, taking two-fifths of the imports, and participating to nearly the same extent in the export trade of the Southern continent.

It is of more immediate interest to the business men of the United States, however, to study the distribution of South America's foreign trade among the various countries that participate in this commerce. To show this I have compiled from the source already indicated a table which gives imports from

and exports to South America by each of the principal nations, with the percentage of the trade transacted by each country. This statement is as follows:

TRADE OF THE PRINCIPAL NATIONS WITH SOUTH AMERICA, 1894.
(Imports from and exports to South America.)

Countries.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.	Percentage.		
				Imports.	Exports.	Total.
United States	$100,147,107	$32,644,450	$132,791,557	23.27	13.62	19.82
United Kingdom	83,492,064	97,118,639	180,610,703	19.40	40.51	26.95
Austria Hungary	9,444,276	1,385,688	10,829,964	2.20	.58	1.62
Belgium	38,483,635	6,652,277	45,135,912	8.93	2.77	6.73
Denmark	1,189,540	54,375	1,243,915	.26	.02	18
France	84,939,300	49,909,800	134,849,100	19.80	20.82	20.13
Germany	83,489,210	34,811,308	118,300,518	19.46	14.52	17.67
Italy	5,514,589	9,620,471	15,135,060	1 26	4.01	2.26
Netherlands	15,772,212	1,776,336	17,548,548	3.65	.74	2.62
Spain	5,966,715	4,200,033	10,166,748	1.37	1.75	1.52
Sweden	888,420	188,940	1,077,360	.20	.08	.16
Canada	872,392	1,392,285	2,264,677	.20	.58	.34
Total	$430,199,46(	$239,754,602	$669,954,062	100	100	100

It will be observed from this table that while the United States is the largest buyer of South American products, taking $15,000,000 more than any other country and nearly one-fourth of all that goes to Europe, England and America, there is no proportionate reciprocity in the trade; for South American countries buy more largely of Great Britain, Germany and France than of the United States. This disproportion in our trade with South America is due to the fact that we are a nation of coffee drinkers. Take out of our imports from South America the $70,000,000 worth of coffee that we buy, and our trade in that direction at once assumes a properly balanced condition, with imports and exports about equal.

Great Britain and Italy are the only nations that have anything of a balance on the right side in their South American trade, the only countries that are able to sell more than they buy there. England dominates the South American markets by virtue of vast investments of British capital, by the enjoyment of cheap and speedy ocean transport and by abundant facilities for international banking. Add to these advantages a low cost of manufacture and a studious regard for the peculiar requirements of each country's trade, and it is not difficult to understand why

England sells to South America three dollars' worth of goods for every dollar's worth we can sell there. Italy's South American trade, though only one-twelfth as large as Great Britain's, shows a large excess of exports over imports. This is due first of all to sentimental considerations—the existence of a large Italian immigrant population in the River Plate countries looking to the mother country for supplies. The Italian steamship lines running direct to the principal South American ports, and the Italian banking houses in the great trade centers of South America, aid mightily in developing trade with Italy. Germany and France each buy as much as England in South America, but the one sells only half and the other about a third as much as Great Britain.

Turning now to our own trade with South America, many suggestive facts present themselves as the figures are analyzed. Our enormous imports of coffee from Brazil, amounting to $60,000,000 in the year ended June 30, 1895, and $55,000,000 in 1896, not only give that country first place in the South American trade of the United States, but also third and sometimes second rank among all the nations from which we buy. Only Great Britain and Germany sell more than Brazil to the United States. But while nearly one-tenth of our imports came from Brazil in the fiscal year just ended, not one-fiftieth part of our exports went to that country. Brazil sells to us and with the proceeds buys from England and France. What Venezuela buys from the United States is usually only about one-third of what we buy from that country, but our trade with the other South American countries shows a fairly equal balance of imports and exports.

In the past forty-five years our trade with South America has grown from $30,170,160 to $145,170,224, nearly a five-fold increase. The total foreign trade of the United States has increased in the same period only about four times—from $399,686,688 to $1,662,316,962. Exports from the United States to South America have increased in forty-five years from $9,750,576 to $36,298,984. While there has been a large increase of imports into the United States from South America since 1890, there has been a considerable decrease in our exports in that direction, owing to the great collapse of British speculation in the Argentine; but it is interesting to note that Great Britain has suffered

far more heavily than the United States in this respect. From 1890 to 1894 our imports from South America increased from $90,006,144 to $100,147,107, while our exports thereto decreased from $39,764,970 to $33,212,310. In the same period British imports from South America increased from $72,989,003 to $82,-734,672, and the exports dropped from $128,787,320 to $96,954,-526. Thus while England and the United States both increased their imports from South America by $10,000,000 during these four years, Great Britain lost $31,832,797 of export trade, or nearly twenty-five per cent., and the United States lost only $6,552,660, or about one-sixth.

A little inquiry into the nature of our present exports to South America and the comparison of our trade with that of Great Britain in staple lines may be suggestive of directions in which the sale of our products in South America might be enlarged. The bulk of our present exports to South America consists of products which meet but little or no competition from other countries. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, commodities of this class figured in the exports of the United States to South America as follows: Flour, $4,563,905; petroleum, $3,203,217; hog products, $4,673,643; lumber, timber, etc., $2,784,319; a total of $15,224,084 out of exports aggregating $33,248,231. The extension of the trade in these products depends less upon the competion of other countries than upon the local conditions in South America, the tariffs imposed by the different governments, and the treaty relations of the United States with those countries.

Other American goods, the products of more advanced stages of manufacture are exported largely to South America. As Great Britain is our most formidable competitor, it is interesting to compare the exports of a few important items of manufactured articles from England and the United States to South America. The British figures are for the calendar year 1895, and the United States figures cover the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895.

	From United States.	From United Kingdom.
Agricultural implements and machinery	$1,313,744	$3,248,407
Carriages, carts, etc	456,073	1,121,527
Cotton cloths	3,475,823	28,303,846
Hardware, tools, etc	640,156	1,827,127
Machinery, engines, etc	2,785,810	4,406,035
Total	$8,671,606	$38,906,942

This table may properly be accepted as the key to the larger South American market which our manufacturers desire to reach, for it shows broadly the five general classes of merchandise in which we are making fair competition with England, but of which we are as yet furnishing only a small share to the people of South America. It appears that the opportunity for the extension of the export trade of the United States in South America lies chiefly along the general lines indicated above.

To follow up successfully the suggestion which is thus given, the manufacturers of the United States need certain information about the markets of South America, the classes of goods that are saleable there, the prices at which they are sold, the terms of credit, and the manner of payment, the names and standing of leading houses, and explicit information concerning the peculiar requirements and conditions in each important market. If we hope to effect a material increase in our exports of manufactured products we must know more of the needs, manners, and customs of foreign peoples than can be learned in hurried visits to the various countries. The success of British, Germans, French, and Belgians in extending their trade in foreign markets is due in large measure to their close personal contact with the purchasers. We must send our men to South America to live among prospective customers, to know and understand the people and obtain their friendship and confidence. Continuous, persistent, personal work is what will bring the quickest, largest, and most lasting enlargement of our trade abroad.

We need better facilities for carrying our goods to foreign markets. The United States is practically of no account in the ocean-carrying trade, and in many of the large ports of the world the American flag is almost unseen and unknown as an emblem of commerce. In fifty years our foreign commerce has increased from $227,497,313 to $1,662,316,962, but the total tonnage of our merchant marine engaged in foreign trade has decreased from 1,047,454 tons to 822,347 in the same time. With nearly eight times the foreign commerce we had half a century ago, we now have only four-fifths of the ocean-carrying tonnage we then had. More than two-thirds of our imports and exports formerly were carried in American vessels, while now but little more than a tenth of this trade is borne in our ships. Not only do the profits earned in transporting millions of dollars' worth of mer-

chandise to and from our ports pass chiefly into the hands of foreign vessel owners, but the vessels themselves are built in foreign yards, giving employment to thousands of men in an industry which ought to be planted in our country.

As in our ocean commerce, so also in our financial relations with other countries, we are dependent largely upon the services rendered by foreign interests. Particularly in our dealings with the nations to the south of us we are in urgent need of direct international banking facilities. We do $150,000,000 worth of business with South America in a year, and yet all our balances have to be settled through English or European banking houses. In the great trade centers of South America the English, the German, the French, and the Italian have their banks, but I think that I am right in saying that there is not an American bank in all South America. Manifestly this is a serious hindrance to our trade.

The consular service of the United States ought to be of immense value in promoting foreign trade in American goods. It does render important service in this direction, but the whole system is subject to such evils and abuses that its efficiency is impaired and its value minimized. Until our consular service shall have been thoroughly overhauled, reorganized, and established upon a sound business basis it will never render to our foreign commerce the aid which it ought to give and which the commercial interests of other countries receive from their consular representatives.

Enough has been seen of the operation of the treaties of reciprocity, which were negotiated under authority of the Tariff Act of 1890, to demonstrate the advantage of the principle involved. Our experience with these treaties was satisfactory as far as it went; but it came to an end too soon to show the full measure of advantages which had been gained by these international commercial agreements. Under a treaty of reciprocity our exports of flour to Brazil increased from an average of 705,000 barrels per annum to 892,000 barrels, but upon the abrogation of the treaty there was a drop to 775,000 barrels in 1895. A reduction in duty effected by a treaty of reciprocity with Germany increased our exports of flour to that country from 8,864 in 1891 to 200,719 barrels in 1893, and 286,229 barrels in 1894; but upon the termination of the treaty the exports fell to 256,650 barrels in 1895,

and 190,644 barrels in 1896, a loss of nearly 100,000 in two years. From 114,000 barrels in 1891 reciprocity swelled our flour exports to Cuba to 662,000 barrels in 1894. Then the treaty was annulled; Spain retaliated by imposing a heavy duty on our flour, and our exports to Cuba declined to 379,856 barrels in 1895, and only 176,724 barrels in the year just ended.

Mr. C. G. Jones, President of the Southwestern Winter Wheat Millers' Association, asserted before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, that the abrogation of the treaty of commercial reciprocity had caused the merchant millers of the United States to lose the sale of 4,000,000 barrels of flour, worth $16,000,000. To produce this in one year would require 135 mills with a daily capacity of 100 barrels each.

The manufacturers of the United States want to have these treaties restored and new ones added.

To my mind the most directly beneficial agency in securing foreign trade for our manufacturers is the display of our goods in the principal foreign markets. The actual exhibition of a steam engine, of a line of shoe samples, of an assortment of hardware, or of a bicycle, is more effectual in impressing a possible purchaser than any amount of talk or printed matter—particularly if both of these be in a language unfamiliar to either buyer or seller. A sample warehouse, well stocked with saleable American goods, and in charge of men thoroughly familiar with both the goods and the market, ought to give a powerful stimulus to the sale of American wares in any important centre of trade.

Trade between the United States and the Latin-American countries is bound to develop steadily. Conditions were never so favorable to the extension of our commerce in that direction as at the present time. Whatever advantages we now possess for cultivating this trade are bound to increase rather than diminish; and to supply what we now lack in the way of information and facilities for transacting business is the problem that presses for immediate solution. The market offered by the countries to the South of us is of vast magnitude and importance, and its needs and the possibilities can not safely be overlooked by the business man, the economist or the statesman of the United States.

THEODORE C. SEARCH.

CURFEW FOR CITY CHILDREN.

BY MRS. JOHN D. TOWNSEND.

For more than thirty years the welfare of children in this country has been to me food for anxious thought. The awful precocity of youth and the criminal irresponsibility of parents, both alarmingly more glaring year by year, have so constantly been before me, that, when the query is made, "Why do you endorse the Curfew?" mentally I reply, "How, with 'ears to hear and eyes to see,' can any one question this movement and its necessity"?

As there is no denying that prevention of crime is better than its punishment, it is certainly best to begin with care for children. Their free and untrammeled life in this country is appalling. We have a foreign population who apparently believe that unlimited license is the definition of freedom. Where there are thirty-one nationalities in one school, as in this city, and other schools where hundreds of children hear English only during their hours of attendance, where there are evening classes for men of all ages up to forty-five who have to be instructed in English in its most elementary forms, with such a large class unable to comprehend American conditions, is it wonderful that we are confronted with crime, in every form, among the youth of the country? It seems appropriate to repeat what General John C. Fremont said to me ten years since: "We should stop promiscuous immigration for thirty years, and allow for a generation of American children. Educated and intelligent immigrants, yes; but ignorant and impoverished, no!"

It is not only among the poor and uneducated that we find lack of parental responsibility. Educated people, with every advantage that money and position can give, are strangely neglectful in the home training of their children. They bring

their children up conventionally, but how many young men or young women have any idea of the responsibilities of life presented to them? Every girl should be educated in the belief that she may be a wife and mother, which, morally considered, are the most important positions in life for her; every boy should be given to understand that manhood brings with it responsibilities, and that the more elevated the position the graver the responsibility is. Home life should be made a strong point by fathers and mothers, and boys should be as carefully guarded and controlled as girls.

With these convictions in mind, a newspaper announcement in January last of "The Boys' and Girls' National Home and Employment Association" attracted my attention and induced me to consider the question of the "Curfew." The announcement was to the effect that Col. Alexander Hogeland, of Lincoln, Neb., President of the association, had sent to the Governors of thirty-one States having winter legislatures, five bills regulating crimes among youth. The bills called for no appropriations and contained the following provisions:

(1.) The restoration to their homes of all truant and tramping youths found in any of the cities, towns, or villages of each State.

(2.) The opening of free county intelligence offices in the office of the county clerk in each county.

(3.) Protection of children in the homes of dissipated and immoral parents.

(4.) Imprisoning of youth, apart from old criminals.

(5.) Providing that boys and girls and minor children in all cities, towns, and villages should be at their homes after nightfall.

I noticed that New York was not one of the thirty-one States mentioned, and I wrote to Colonel Hogeland asking why he had so discriminated as to the States. It ended by his appointing me to represent the association in this State, and he forwarded documents to aid and instruct me in the undertaking.

For months since I have watched the papers for evidence of that which I wished to ameliorate, if not cure, and have found abundant reasons for the work. In February last I sounded the first note in this State, which brought forth some hearty sympathy, some derision, and unbounded incredulity as to the possibility of accomplishing anything in this city. I have not been

discouraged, and I am daily adding to the evidence which demonstrates the necessity for decisive action. It has been a gruesome task, my search having been prolific in results. I have a collection from the daily journals of this year comprising records of "child crime" (sad juxtaposition of words) from the ages of six to twenty-one inclusive.

I am well aware that I am diverging from the exact subject of early hours for children, but no one can doubt that the crimes of older children have more or less connection with the street association of younger children in the night hours. Between six and fifteen years of age almost every known crime is committed in this city, and the period between sixteen and twenty-one seems to be the most fruitful of crime. A most potent reason for the prosecution of this work is the fact that the present youth may be the future legislators and government officials of this country.

I have been told by one of our public-school "attendance officers," whose work it is to gather in the truant school children, that the mothers of such children are largely in favor of the Curfew. One old man said: "Indeed he should be thankful for anything that would keep his children in at night." It has been suggested, through anonymous letters sent to me, that probably I have never had children of my own and consequently had no sympathy for others. Having brought up a family, my whole sympathy is for children and hence my active effort in this cause.

Whether parental neglect arises from poverty, recklessness, or natural indifference, it is unnecessary to inquire; probably each contributes. The effect upon the children, however, is to deprive them of the home influence which in early life is invaluable. The only remedy seems to be compulsory responsibility, as indicated by the Curfew Ordinance. And if it is necessary that such protection should be afforded to children in a city of one hundred and fifty thousand population, how much more is it desirable where the population is so much greater—so large a proportion of the children thereof having been surrounded by vice from birth.

Beyond the advantages to the youth and right-thinking parents, the aid thus afforded to the police in the suppression of crime must be considered, as also the additional comfort afforded

to citizens who are compelled to be abroad at night, in being freed from the shocking sights and sounds which greet the eye and ear in many portions of our city.

In the beginning of February last the Curfew Ordinance was established in Lincoln, Neb., meeting with favor from all classes. The Mayor and City Council heartily endorsed it in a set of attested resolutions, and recommended its introduction in every city in the United States.

In June, 1896, I received a statement announcing that two hundred cities had adopted the Curfew, and that city officials, parents, school teachers, employers of youthful labor, and especially chiefs of police were emphatic in their praise of its efficacy. Some of the sentiments expressed are as follows.

The Chief of Police of Omaha reports: "It is now an easy matter to enforce home rules." Chief Broder, of St. Joseph says: "The adoption of the Curfew is an act of humanity to that class of fathers and mothers with boys and girls who defy home restraint, and it will prevent crime and save taxes." Employers of labor say they get better work because better hours are kept. School teachers testify they get better work for the same reason. Chief of Police Melick, of Lincoln, Neb., says that "after the Curfew was in force a few weeks, arrests for disorderly conduct and truancy fell off fully seventy-five per cent."; and he adds: "I cannot see why any city government in the country should hesitate to enact the ordinance." The Mayor of North Platte, Neb., says: "In the two years we have had the Curfew we have sent no children to the Reform School, whereas before that we sent quite a number." Colonel Hogeland says: "The size of a city need not be any excuse for not enacting the Curfew Ordinance"; and that "it can be enforced without additional expense." In our own public schools we now employ twenty truant, or, as they are called, "attendance officers," at a cost to the city of over $20,000, and it is hard and constant work.

New Jersey has now become interested in this work. In Melville, Cape May, Salem, Elmer, Mount Holly, and other towns the matter is being investigated. In Trenton the Rev. George C. Maddock, Secretary of the State Penal Commission and Chaplain of the New Jersey State's Prison, has inaugurated the movement. I have seen it stated that the question will be brought before the New Jersey Legislature this winter. The

State Charities Aid Association of New Jersey have taken it into serious consideration.

According to the statistics afforded by the Association in 1892, in eleven cities 13,000 policemen arrested 450,000 men, women, and children, at an expense of $20,000,000. Among an equal number of farmers there were not 5,000 arrests.

Of the 13,000 boys and girls in reform schools in 1890, 98 per cent. went from cities, towns, and villages; that is, from one-third of the population, as two-thirds resided on farms.

Money is freely given and appropriated for the building and maintenance of States prisons, jails, poor-houses, work-houses, lunatic asylums, reformatories, truant farms, truant schools, and kindred institutions, people feeling righteous in the doing thereof. At the suggestion, however, of a measure whereby the necessity for these institutions may be lessened, we are met with apathy, or at least we have been until recently.

The Curfew Ordinance places responsibility where it belongs, on the parents.

This Association was incorporated at Washington in 1889. The members have held several conventions, and are now preparing to hold another in Cleveland next month.

Judging from the list of subjects sent to me, which are to come under discussion, it seems as if nothing connected with the welfare of children had been forgotten, yet they still ask for suggestions from others.

Much has already been accomplished by societies in New York inaugurated for the suppression of crime; and were it not for the strength which may be afforded by them, it would indeed be a hopeless task to anticipate success in this movement here. The Society for the Suppression of Obscene Literature has done great work. Its power should be extended to the prevention of the sale of that kind of literature among children which, although not absolutely obscene, is calculated to breed and foster crime among them.

As yet no definite action has been taken to bring this movement to the official notice of the authorities of this State or city. It has not been deemed wise to do so until a more thorough understanding of it has been had with the public. It is sincerely to be hoped that our newspapers will aid it, and that the societies already existing will give assistance in furtherance of the design.

The great pioneer in the United States in the labor for prevention of crime—Edward Livingston—made the following remark as long ago as 1833 :

"To arrest the vicious before the profligacy assumes the shape of crime . . . will be found more effectual in the suppression of offences, and more economical, than the best organized system of punishment."

Charles Loring Brace, who was so well known years ago in this city as a devoted worker among the children of the poor, in the introduction to his book, *The Dangerous Classes of New York*, says : "The class of a large city most dangerous to its property, its morals, and its political life are the ignorant, destitute, untrained, and abandoned youth ; the outcast street-children grown up to be voters, to be the implements of demagogues, the 'feeders' of the criminals, and the sources of domestic outbreaks and violations of law."

MRS. JOHN D. TOWNSEND.

WHAT SHALL BE DONE ABOUT CUBA?

BY MAYO W. HAZELTINE.

WHEN Congress reassembles on the first Monday of this month one of the most urgent questions which it will be called on to consider will be why the President of the United States has failed to carry out the resolution passed by both Houses during their last session—the resolution to the effect that, in the judgment of Congress, the time had came to recognize the Cuban revolutionists as belligerents. It is possible that in his annual message Mr. Cleveland may be able to set forth reasons satisfactory to Congress for his failure to fulfil its wishes. Should, on the other hand, his reasons prove unsatisfactory, the whole Cuban question will be brought up anew, and Congress will have to determine what additional and more effective measures ought to be taken to secure the attainment of its purpose. Once more, then, the American people and their representatives at Washington will have to ask themselves, first: Is the present revolution in Cuba morally justified? and, secondly: Is it so far successful as to warrant our government in recognizing the independence, or, at all events, the belligerency of the Cubans? The first inquiry will compel us to review very briefly the character of Spanish rule in the island, in its threefold aspects of a fiscal, a commercial, and an administrative régime; the second inquiry will lead us to investigate the historical precedents for the intervention of the United States in Spanish-American affairs, and also to consider the special grounds for conforming to those precedents in the case of Cuba.

I.

Before exposing the three forms of official spoliation practised by Spaniards in Cuba, we should forestall the possible re-

joinder that the native Cubans, being represented in the Parliament at Madrid, are themselves partially responsible for the existing abuses. The native Cubans are represented in the Cortes only in name. A considerable number of members are ostensibly allotted to the island, but these members are chosen under an electoral law deliberately framed to accomplish two objects; first, to reduce the number of voters, and, second, to give always a majority to the European Spaniards sojourning in the island, although the latter represent only 9.3 per centum of the total population of Cuba. To these ends the law made the right of voting dependent on the payment of a very high poll tax, which proved the more burdensome as the ten years' war had ruined the greater number of the Cuban proprietors. In these ways the electoral law succeeded in restricting the right of suffrage to only 53,000 inhabitants in an island which has a population of 1,600,000 ; that is to say, to the derisory proportion of 3 per cent. To show how the law works, we may cite the municipal district of Guines, the population of which is made up of 12,500 native Cubans, and only 500 Spaniards and Canary Islanders; nevertheless, on its electoral list one finds the name of 32 native Cubans and of 400 Spaniards. We can now understand why the number of native Cuban representatives in the Cortes, a body comprising 430 members, has never exceeded six, and has seldom exceeded three. The great majority of the so-called Cuban deputation has always consisted of Spanish Peninsulars; consequently, the ministers have always been able to command a pretended majority of Cuban votes, and thus to give a spurious appearance of acceptability to their legislative acts. Farcical, therefore, is Cuba's participation in the work of the national legislation. We add that, through the contrivance of the law, or through irregularities committed in its application, the Cubans have been deprived also of their due representation in the local corporations. Thus, in 1891, the Spaniards predominated in 31 out of 37 *ayuntamientos*, or town councils, in the province of Havana. In Guines, where, as we have said, there are 12,500 Cubans in its 13,000 inhabitants, not a single Cuban was to be found among its town councillors. At the same epoch there were only three Cuban deputies in the Provincial Deputation of Havana ; two in that of Matanzas, and three in that of Santa Clara. Finally, out of twenty governors of the province of Matanzas, only two have

been Cubans; one of these was a professional bureaucrat, and the other was an army officer who had fought against his country. During the same period there has been only one native Cuban permitted to act as governor in the province of Havana, and he had spent almost the whole of his life in Spain. In the other provinces there has never been a governor who was born in the island.

Now let us see what use Spain has made of the legislative and administrative powers which she has monopolized to the practically total exclusion of the Cubans. Let us begin with the fiscal régime. The insurrection of 1868-78 brought about the abolition of slavery, and this, of course, involved a great economical dislocation. Prudence and good feeling would have dictated the policy of lightening the fiscal burdens of the island under such trying circumstances; on the contrary, the mother country overwhelmed the colony with enormous budgets, reaching in 1879 and 1880 as high a figure as $46,000,000. By 1893 the budgets had been cut down to $26,000,000, but the reduction was due, not to consideration for the taxpayers, but to necessity. The island had proved unable to meet the enormous exactions attempted. In 1880 the deficit had reached the alarming sum of $20,000,000; in 1883 it was nearly $10,000,000; the accumulated amount of all the deficits since 1878 is $100,000,000—so vast has been the difference between the appropriations and the revenues. With such management, Cuba's debt has increased at a rate which, compared with the island's resources, seems fabulous. In 1868 the debt was $25,000,000. When the present war broke out, on February 24, 1895, it amounted to $190,000,000. On July 31, 1895, it was computed to have reached $295,000,000. Now, of course, it is far greater. The interest on this debt at the date last named, imposed a burden of $9.79 on each inhabitant. What this means will be evident, when we call to mind that the French people, the most overburdened with taxes on the earth, owe only $6.36 per inhabitant. Not a cent of the enormous sum thus borrowed has been spent in Cuba, to advance the work of improvement and civilization. For what, then, has the debt been incurred? It includes a debt of Spain to the United States; it includes the expense of Spain's occupation of San Domingo in 1861; the cost of Spain's invasion of Mexico; the cost of her hostile expedition against

Peru; money advanced to the Spanish Treasury during the recent Carlist wars; and finally, all that Spain has spent to uphold its domination in Cuba, and to cover the lavish expenditures since 1868.

Let us turn to the commercial and industrial regime, and inquire what Spain has done to promote or permit the development of wealth, and thus enable the Cubans to bear the monstrous burden of taxation. In view of the fact that Cuba produces almost exclusively for export, and imports almost everything she consumes, it is plain that all she asks of the mother country is that her output shall not be hampered with onerous regulations, nor her commercial relations obstructed; it being for the obvious interest of the island to buy cheap where it suits her, and to sell her products at a profit. Spain has done the very opposite of what she should have done. She has treated tobacco as an enemy; she has loaded sugar with incessant imposts; she has shackled with abusive excise duties the cattle-raising industry; she has thrown almost insuperable obstacles in the way of the mining industry. Nor is this all; she has stranded the colony in the network of a tariff which subjects Cuba to a ruinous monopoly on the part of the producers and merchants of certain regions of Spain. The duties which many foreign articles have to bear, when imported into Cuba, exceed by 2,000—and even 2,300—per cent. those borne by the corresponding Spanish products. For example, a hundred kilograms of knitted goods pay, if from Spain, $10.95; if from a foreign country, $195. A thousand kilograms of bags for sugar, when they are Spanish, pay $4.69; if they come from any other country they pay $82.50. A hundred kilograms of cassimere, if it is a Spanish product, pay $15.47; if foreign, $300.

If, now, we pass to the bureaucratic form of spoliation, we observe that in the budget of 1894-95, a budget amounting to $26,411,000, only $756,925 were allotted to interior improvements; all the rest went to pay the interest on the debt or the cost of the civil and military administration. Shameless and almost incredible is the extortion practised on a thinly-peopled and impoverished island in the matter of official salaries. To the Governor-General of Cuba is given a salary of $50,000, besides a palace in Havana and a country house, servants, coaches, and a fund for secret expenses. The Director-General of the Treasury receives

a salary of $18,500. The Archbishop of Santiago and the Bishop of Havana get $18,000 each. The Commander-General of the naval station has $16,392 a year. The General "Segundo Cabo," or second in command upon the island, and the President of the Audiencia receive $15,000 each. The Governor of Havana, and the Secretary of the general government, $8,000. The Major-Generals get $7,500; Brigadier-Generals $4,500, or, when in command, $5,000; the Captains of the largest men-of-war receive $6,300; the captains of frigates, $4,560. Even government clerks of the first class obtain $5,000 each, and those of the second class $4,000. All these functionaries are entitled to free lodgings and to domestic servants paid by the state. Below the officials mentioned is a multitude of minor employees, all munificently provided for. It is, in a word, far more lucrative to be employed by the Spanish colonial government in Cuba than to be an office-holder under the federal government at Washington. Lastly, it is in the office of the Minister of "Ultramar," or of the colonies—who resides in Madrid, and to whom $96,800 a year is assigned from the treasury of Cuba—that we find centering the saturnalia in which Spanish bureaucrats indulge at the expense of the plundered island. Sometimes through incapacity, but more often through outright dishonesty, the money wrung from the Cuban taxpayers is squandered at Madrid. Minister Romero Robledo took at one time (in 1892) a million dollars belonging to the Cuban treasury from the vaults of the Bank of Spain, and lent it to the Trans-Atlantic Company, of which he was a stockholder. Threatened with prosecution, he replied that, if prosecuted, all his predecessors from every political party would have to sit beside him in the dock. In June, 1890, a debate in the Cortes brought out the outrageous fact that $6,500,000 had been abstracted from the *Caja de Depositos*, although the safe was locked with three keys, each of which was in the possession of a different functionary. Then was it also made known that through false vouchers for transportation, and fictitious bills for provisions, alleged to have been furnished during the ten years' war in Cuba, the Cuban treasury had been robbed of $22,811,000. In March of the same year General Pando asserted that the thefts perpetrated through the issue of warrants by the Board of the Public Debt exceeded the sum of $12,000,000. Not one of the persons implicated in these disgraceful transactions has been punished. We recall,

finally, that in August, 1887, General Marin entered the Havana Custom House at the head of a military force, investigated the scandalous operations there carried on, and discharged every employee. The act caused a great deal of noise, but not one of the officials was indicted, or suffered any further punishment. How could any of them be punished? Every official, who comes to Cuba, has an influential patron at the Court of Madrid, for whose protection he pays with regularity.

Is, at least, the administration of justice pure? Are the lives and properties of Cubans safe, even in time of peace? The truth is that personal safety has long been a myth in Cuba. The civil-guard, or armed police, are the terror of the rural districts, and, while they are beating and murdering defenceless countrymen, notorious highwaymen are allowed to ply their trade unscathed. It has been asserted that no executions for political offenses have taken place since 1878, but this was because the government resorted to the simpler expedient of assassination. Frequent have been the mysterious deaths of Cubans, who had capitulated. To one of these deaths was due the uprising of Tunas de Bayamo in 1879; the assassination of Brigadier-General Vidal has been proved to have been committed in compliance with an order from the Spanish General Polavieja. The same Spanish General has acknowledged that in December of 1880 a large number of persons were arrested by his order in Cuba, and transported the same day and hour to the African Island of Fernando Po. After the last short insurrection of 1879-80 it was a frequent occurrence for Cubans, who had capitulated under a solemn promise of amnesty, to be sent to the penal colonies of Africa. Are the honor and property of Cubans any safer than are their lives? The very idea of a lawsuit frightens every honest Cuban. Nobody believes in the integrity or the independence of the judges; they are considered, and consider themselves, mere political tools. Not only the Attorneys-general, but the presiding judges, receive their instructions at the Governor-general's office. In spite of the provisions of the Constitution, imprisonments without warrant, and for an indefinite time, are common. Twice have the Governors of Cuba violated the Constitution by establishing a special tribunal to deal with offences of the press. In the rare instances when a straightforward and impartial judge has undertaken to deal justly with a case, in which the interests of influential people were involved,

he has been replaced by a more tractable member of the bench.

In view of the facts above enumerated, it will scarcely be pretended that the insurrection of the Cubans is not justified. They have ten times as much cause to rebel as their fellow-subjects on the American mainland had in the first quarter of this century. They have a hundred times more provocation than had the thirteen English colonies in 1775. But let us not refuse to listen to the apologists for Spain. They tell us, first, that the insurrection was unwarranted, because at the very hour when it broke out, Spain was about to give to Cuba the reforms which the islanders desired. They allege, secondly, that however bad may be the present condition of Cuba, the success of the revolutionists would make it immeasurably worse. That success, they say, would be followed by a race war of extermination between the whites and the blacks, and the ultimate fate of Cuba would be the fate of Hayti. Let us examine these assertions, and let us begin with the last, because it can be disposed of in a sentence. When the negro uprising took place in Hayti, there were in the French-speaking portion of the island of Hispañiola, 16 blacks to one white; there are at present in the island of Cuba two whites for every colored person. So much for the danger of a race war, and the annihilation of the whites. Now for the allegation that Spain had enacted, and was about to carry out in Cuba, the coveted reforms in administration, when the present rebellion began. The reference, of course, is to the scheme originally formulated by Minister Maura, but subsequently modified by Minister Abarzuas and now known by his name. What does the Abarzuas project amount to? It in no wise changes the electoral law, which, as we have said, defranchises the vast majority of Cubans. It in no wise curtails the power of the bureaucracy. It would leave on the Cuban taxpayer the identical burdens now weighing upon him, and it would give him no right to participate in the formation of the general budgets for the island. The Abarzuas law would do absolutely nothing but change the present Council of Administration, all the members of which are now appointed by the government, into a partially elective body. Under this professed reform, one-half of the members of the Council are still to be appointed by the government, but the other half are to be chosen by qualified electors, that is to say, by persons who pay a certain amount of

taxes. The Governor-General, however, is to have the right to veto all the resolutions of the Council, and to suspend at will all of the elective members. What is the Council, thus made up, and thus tied, hand and foot, empowered to do? It is authorized to form a kind of special budget embracing the small items now included in the general budget of Cuba under the head of *Fomento* or interior improvements. To these items, as we have said, was allotted in the budget of 1894–95 exactly $746,925 out of $26,411,000. All the rest of the general budget of Cuba the state reserves for itself. In other words, the Council is to dispose of less than three per cent. of the revenues of Cuba, while the officials appointed in Madrid distribute, as at present, 97 per cent. The general budget would, as heretofore, be made up in Spain; there, too, the tariff laws would be enacted. Under the Abarzuas project, in fine, the Cubans would continue to be treated as a subjugated people; all the power would remain in the hands of the Spanish government and its delegates in Cuba, and all the influence attainable would be exercised by the Spanish residents. No wonder the Cubans repudiated the scheme. They would have been wanting in the instincts of self-preservation had they accepted from the mother country such a grotesque counterfeit of home rule.

II.

The Cuban revolution, then, was justified, if ever a revolution was. Has it attained such a measure of success that the revolutionists deserve, at least, to be recognized as belligerents, and would such a recognition be in accordance with the traditional policy of the United States? There is no doubt that, although less than two years have elapsed since the rising in February, 1895, the Cuban insurgents have overrun, and have continued to hold, a much larger tract of country than did their predecessors in the ten years' war. During the greater part of that conflict, the rebellion was confined to the eastern provinces, and, although at times the insurgent forces entered the central portion of the island, the province of Pinar del Rio, lying west of Havana, was not once penetrated. At present, the Spaniards control no considerable section of the island outside of the seaports and a few strongly fortified towns in the interior. The open country, together with the villages and smaller towns, is almost wholly in

the power of the revolutionists. Two of the Cuban commanders, General Gomez and General Garcia, move at will through the eastern and central departments; for some time not even an attempt has been made to cope with them. General Antonio Maceo is strongly entrenched among the mountains of the western province, and it remains to be seen whether Governor-General Weyler can manage to dislodge him. It is well-known that the revolutionists have organized a *de facto* government. They have adopted a constitution; they have assumed a national name; they possess a national flag, and they have despatched a delegate plenipotentiary to treat with the government of the United States. It is true that they possess no navy and no seaport, but in this respect they are not much worse off than were the thirteen American colonies when their independence was recognized by France. They are quite as well off as were their Spanish-American kinsmen when the independence of the Peruvian and Colombian Republics was recognized by the United States, for at that time the mother country retained control of all the principal seaports on the Spanish Main and on the seacoast of Peru. They are better off than were the Greeks when England, France, and Russia interposed to assure their deliverance from the Ottoman yoke. From another point of view the claim of the Cubans to be recognized as belligerents is even more irresistible. How can we refuse to say that a state of war exists in Cuba when Spain herself avows the fact by assembling under her colors on the island upward of 200,000 soldiers? How can any one describe as a local and transient disturbance an upheaval, which for nearly two years Spain has striven in vain to suppress, although she has taxed to the utmost her resources in men and money? Spain is forced at this moment to maintain in Cuba an army twice as large as the Ottoman Sultan and his vassal Mehemet Ali could muster in 1828 for the subjugation of Greece, and four times as large as the Anglo-German force which Great Britain was able to launch against her revolted American colonies during our revolutionary war. If it is not war which exists in Cuba, why in the name of common sense has Spain sent thither nearly the whole of her available navy, and a land force that will presently number almost a quarter of a million of troops? Indubitably war it is, and, as we have shown it to be a righteous one, the Cubans are en-

titled to a recognition of its existence at the hands of foreign powers, and especially of the American republics. It is idle to say that the Cubans, if they were wise, would not insist on being recognized as belligerents. True enough it is that such a recognition on the part of the United States might subject *us* to some inconvenience. The parent government would be thereby relieved from responsibility for acts done in the insurgent territory; its blockade of Cuban ports would have to be respected; and Spain would acquire a right to exercise against neutral commerce all the powers of a party to a maritime war. Of trivial moment to us, however, would be the inconveniences resulting from the right of search, compared to the damage wrought by a prolongation of the struggle, the destruction of lives and property, the annihilation of agricultural and mining industries, and the impoverishment of the island's commerce with this country. Already our interchange of products with Cuba has been cut down to a fraction of what it was at the beginning of the war, and investments of American capital are seriously threatened. Moreover, the question of recognizing the Cubans as belligerents is not one to be looked at merely from a sordid point of view. High principles of morality are involved in the matter, and grave international duties are imposed upon our government. As Mr. Richard H. Dana has pointed out in his edition of Wheaton, a government under such circumstances "owes it to its own citizens, to the contending parties, and to the peace of the world, to make a decision seasonably." We have no moral right to remain impassive spectators of a gallant struggle for liberty; no right to leave the insurgents deprived of a recognized *status* in the forum of international law, and of the opportunity to employ commissioned cruisers at sea, and to exert all the powers known to maritime warfare with the sanction of foreign nations.

Not only is it our manifest duty on abstract grounds to recognize the Cubans as belligerents, but such a recognition would be in strict conformity with the traditional policy of our government. With regard to the nascent Spanish-American republics, the administration of James Monroe acted upon a principle propounded by himself as follows: "As soon as the movement assumes such a steady and consistent form as to make the success of the province probable, the rights, to which they were entitled

by the law of nations as equal parties in a civil war, have been extended to them." Again, in a despatch dated September 20, 1836, and addressed by Mr. Forsyth, Secretary of State, to the Mexican plenipotentiary in Washington, the habitual attitude of our government toward Spanish-American revolutionists is thus defined: "It is a well-known fact that the vessels of the South American provinces were admitted into the ports of the United States under their own or any other flags from the commencement of the revolution; and it is equally true that throughout the various civil contests that have taken place at different periods among the States which sprang from that revolution, the vessels of each of the contending parties have been alike permitted to enter the ports of this country. It has never been held necessary, as a preliminary to the extension of the rights of hospitality to either, that the chances of the war should be balanced, and the probability of eventual success entertained. For this purpose it has been deemed sufficient that the party had declared its independence, and was at the time actually maintaining it." A remarkable application of the principle here set forth was made in the case of Texas. The Texans declared their independence from Mexico on March 2, 1836. This was signed by but sixty men, of whom only two were of Mexican nationality. Nevertheless, just six months afterwards the United States recognized the belligerent rights of the Texans by proclaiming the neutrality of the United States in the contest between them and Mexico.

Why should the recognition of belligerency, which was so promptly conceded to the Texans, be deferred so long in the case of Cuba? Such a recognition was, we need not say, conceded to the Texans when the neutrality of the United States was proclaimed. It is, or ought to be, well understood that the United States are not acting the part of neutrals in the present contest between Cubans and Spaniards. The frequent use in newspapers of the term "infraction of the neutrality laws," as applied to filibustering expeditions, is misleading. The United States cannot be neutral, because they have not acknowledged the existence of a state of war in Cuba. If they had, the rights of belligerency would have followed as a matter of course.

What are the special reasons why we should be peculiarly eager to do for the Cubans what we promptly did for other

Spanish-American revolutionists? We are far more closely bound to Cuba by trade ties than to any other part of Latin America. The value of all the commodities exported from Cuba in 1890 was $70,608,000, of which $58,570,000, or nearly 83 per cent., were sent to the United States. The value of the products forwarded that year to the Spanish peninsula was only $8,121,000, or 11.5 per cent. So far, then, as commercial interests are concerned, Cuba is already far more intimately connected with the United States that she is with her mother country. As regards the other motives which impel us to feel a particular concern for the welfare of the Cubans, these have never been more concisely and impressively summed up than they were in the instructions to our Minister at Madrid issued in 1823 by John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State. After referring to Cuba and Porto Rico, the only American possessions of which Spain still retained undisputed possession, Mr. Adams continued: "Those islands from their local position are natural appendages to the North American Continent, and one of them (Cuba), which is almost in sight of our shores, from a multitude of considerations, has become an object of transcendent importance to the commercial and political interests of our Union. Its commanding position with reference to the Gulf of Mexico and the West India seas; the character of its population; its situation midway between our southern coasts and the island of San Domingo; its safe and capacious harbor of the Havana, fronting a long line of our shores, destitute of the same advantage; the nature of its productions and of its wants, furnishing the supplies and needing the returns of a commerce immensely profitable and mutually beneficial; all these things give it an importance in the sum of our national interests with which that of no other foreign territory can be compared, and little inferior to that which binds the different members of this Union together. Such, indeed, are between the interests of that island and of this country, the geographical, commercial, moral, and political relations, gathering in the process of time, and even now verging to maturity, that, in looking forward to the probable course of events for the short period of half a century, it is scarcely possible to resist the conviction that the annexation of Cuba to our Republic will be indispensable to the continuance and integrity of the Union itself."

M. W. HAZELTINE.

REFORM OF THE CURRENCY.

BY J. C. ADAMS, PRESIDENT OF THE INDIANAPOLIS BOARD OF TRADE; A. K. MILLER, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW ORLEANS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; AND HUGH CRAIG, PRESIDENT OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

I.

THE verdict of the conservative, reflective, and patriotic people of this country, as expressed in the recent election, was positive in its judgment of distrust of Mr. Bryan, disapproval of the wild vagaries and financial heresies advocated by him, as it was overwhelming in its condemnation of the destructive policies set forth in the Chicago platform.

Aside from the question of upholding constitutional government which involved the supremacy of the laws supporting the properly constituted authorities in suppressing disorder and maintaining peace and social order, and a sentiment of deference and respect toward one of the great co-ordinate branches of our government, the judiciary, this avalanche of majorities from Maine to California must be taken as a pronounced and emphatic expression of disapproval toward the party or platform whose policy or purpose would lead to a debasement of our currency. By the ballot the American people have spoken boldly and without evasion in favor of a sound and unfluctuating currency and an honest and staple system of finance.

The cause of the great party that was successful on November 3d in this campaign of common sense and education was upheld before the people in the contention that we now had the best and soundest currency in the world; that our system of finance had stood the test of time and varying conditions, and should be kept intact and maintained at all hazards. Thousands of our ablest

speakers, and tons of literature spread broadcast by the National Committee, supported this view and advanced the belief, backed by sound logic and argument that could not be controverted, that the threat and avowed purpose of the Popocrats to change or alter our financial system and tinker with the currency was the cause of the business depression, unrest, and panicky feeling that prevailed in this country since the Chicago Convention adjourned.

And now, before the echoes of this cyclone of public indignation against those whose success meant industrial paralysis, personal bankruptcy, and national dishonor have passed away, we are confronted with a proposition to further revise our financial system by national legislation. We must recognize the necessity of ultimately retiring our greenback currency by issuing a long-time low interest-bearing bond which could be sold to our own people and used as a circulating medium in place of the three hundred and sixty million government notes or greenbacks now in circulation, which act as a standing menace to our gold reserve. For the reason that the Senate of the United States is so organized that the small silver States hold the balance of power and have the same votes as New York or Pennsylvania, it would certainly reject any measure that did not provide for free coinage at a ratio of 16 to 1. But a sentiment of admiration amounting almost to love for the greenback currency exists among our people. It was the greenback that helped to save the nation's life. It has been used as money for a generation. It is more convenient and acceptable to handle or carry than silver or gold, and a proposition to retire it and issue in its stead an interest-bearing note to be used as currency, no matter how low that interest may be, will not meet with favor from a large number of our people. Especially will this be true when it is known that many eminent statesmen, such as Senator Sherman and others, are pronounced and outspoken in opposition to any measure that would take the greenback from circulation. However strong and effective our safeguards may be, a President like Mr. Bryan, with a Congress in accord with his views, would soon find a way to override and disregard legislative restrictions. The practical and feasible course to pursue at this time would be for the commercial bodies and Boards of Trade of the country to take steps looking to the creation of a commission, composed

of practical, conservative business men empowered to formulate and recommend to the American Congress a system of currency and finance, removed as far as possible from the domain of party politics, that would determine and settle this vexed question, so that in the future it would not appear in every campaign to cause unrest and apprehension to the great business and industrial interests of the land.

J. C. ADAMS.

II.

THE hard times from which the country has suffered during the past three and a half years have been due not to any especial infirmity in the currency, but simply to a depletion (which has resulted from a low tariff) of national revenue and industrial earnings. The provision of 1890 for the purchase of silver bullion, to the extent of four and a half million ounces per month, did communicate a disease to the currency; yet so assured were both our revenue and industries that when, in order to compass a repeal of that provision, President Cleveland called an extraordinary session of Congress five months after his return to executive duty, he gave frank testimony to the wonderful prosperity which had prevailed despite that improvident enactment. His message recited that "with plenteous crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, sudden financial distrust and fear have sprung up on every side." The threat of a low tariff and the election of a Congress to discharge that threat, seemed fully to explain the "sudden distrust." Capital began to shrink into covert and the industries winced, just as one's nerves feel, before its descent, a knife aimed to strike. The repeal of the silver-purchasing clause in no wise appeased the distrust; the promise of remunerative production, the invitation to investment and the satisfactory assurance to business enterprise still became less and less, down to the ultimate enactment of the present tariff. What followed, in the absolute prostration of scores of industries, now fast regaining their feet, in our lack of adequate revenue for the needs of the government, in our constraint to sell bonds, in our increase of debt, and in our market-disquiets, need not be rehearsed. The fault has not been in our currency, but in the denial of a fair opportunity for its service in

reasonably confident enterprise; in the arrest by distrust of its proper distribution through all the employments.

To throw away millions of duties to the foreigner as donations, and then tease them back as loans, is not business-like; nor is inviting foreign competition in our markets so that wages may steal away in the price of imported commodities to other bread-winners than our own. The late Vice-Presidential candidate, Mr. Sewall, said concerning the industry of shipbuilding at a mass meeting at Bath, Me., two years ago: "If we can go to the Clyde, and buy ships ten or twenty per cent. cheaper than we can build them here, not another ship will be built in that yard." The people having just declared for an honest dollar; having pledged forty-nine cents' worth of faith to reinforce fifty-one cents' worth of silver, while the issue of that metal is limited to the measure of our gold-power to steady it; having discovered that adulterating currency is not making more purchase power, but impairing it, there seems to be no need of any further present experiment at "reform of the currency."

The earning power of the wage-earner's arm must have health behind it; to currency the needed health is such conditions of credit as shall encourage its active outreach.

Unquestionably the main issue in the late election was protection. This fact is witnessed in the prompt summons addressed from the polls in 1894 to the present House of Representatives; in the peremptory reassertion of the same protection purpose in 1895; in the evasion of the tariff question at Chicago last July by the projecting of another issue in flat contradiction of all Democratic history down to 1892; in the steadfast insistence of the President-elect upon the protection issue and the prominence of that issue in the platform whereon he stood; in the widespread resentments of capital and labor because of the grave privation they had sustained, and in their recognition that unlimited silver meant, among other mischiefs, forty-nine per cent. less of the present low duties paid by the foreigner.

Mr. McKinley was numerously supported by other than his own partisans, because the Chicago Convention saw, in view of the Democratic tariff reverses of 1894 and 1895, a popular determination, which many Populists shared, for a better tariff, and it erroneously presumed that a misinterpretation of Democratic doctrine in respect of the currency would work no defection in

Democratic ranks, while it would attract Populist recruits. The result was to array against Mr. Bryan not only the protectionists, but also that part of the Democracy which would not surrender a conviction in respect of gold as a measure of value. This element preferred the Democracy of Jefferson, Jackson, Benton, and Tilden to that of Bryan, which was a capitulation to men who were Populists—truants in most States from the Democratic party. To this minority of McKinley's supporters the currency was the main issue; to the majority industrial protection was, doubtless, the main issue, with a keener tingle given to it by the currency issue, while the Chicago menace to our judiciary quickened general apprehension.

In other words, the result of the recent struggle, as a whole, means, so far as relates to currency, rescuing it from vitiation, unlocking it from its hiding places, and putting it to work in an atmosphere of good faith. This involves ample revenue to the government for its needs, shrinkage of our national debt, and an impetuous circulation of our currency in industrial rewards.

While, in view of the constraints and cautions imposed upon national banks, the 10 per cent. restriction upon their issues might, perhaps, be removed, we need no more per capita than we have now—$24.65—which is more than we ever had before; what we do need is its active employment. Some contend that we should retire our United States notes and thus arrest their suction power upon the Treasury, but from 1879, when we began resumption, down to the hour when deficiency in revenue was threatened, less than three millions of these notes had been annually presented for redemption, while during the past three and a half years over one hundred millions of the notes have been so presented each year. The fault has not been in the persistent reissues of notes, but in the lack of revenue which made such reissues necessary. A man who claps a mustard plaster on his stomach after having overeaten has no reason to blame the hot plaster for his own folly. We had better make such provision by law that, for some time to come, at least, the burden of providing gold for note redemption will not be thrown upon banks, but that we may secure proper income from such people as want our market, through duties on imports that compete with ours, and reopen reciprocity treaties in respect of dissimilar products, in order to draw in stores of for-

eign gold for our meat, farm, and factory products, distributed abroad. We can thus best reinforce our currency system, and what is reciprocity but elastic protection? During the same December week in which the Wilson Congress met, the London Chamber of Commerce rallied all the trade bodies of England to complain to the British government that, in that year, British merchants had by reason of our reciprocity treaties sustained losses to the extent of thirty millions of dollars. A return to reciprocity, be it said, would involve no peril to the sugar industry of this State. The chemical analysis of the soil of numerous States even as high up as Oregon, the extent of sugar beet production in them before the Fifty-third Congress discouraged it, and the evidence that they are superior to Germany for that staple, seem to denote that an application of the measure of duty on foreign sugar as bounty on domestic sugar would profitably diversify Western agriculture, multiply Louisianas, and so expand a great industry as soon to obviate our need of a pound of the imported staple. Where criticism might be most expected the bounty could be shared by farmers, competition with whose wheat exports now demands more and more new service from their acreage, and so far as Louisiana is concerned she would no longer be subject to the caprice of this or that Congress, but have stout and steadfast allies there with a kindred interest from divers States. She is but one forty-fifth of the statehood of this Union, and cannot afford to antagonize anew forty-four other forty-fifths, when the Dingley emergency-bill, which has already passed the House, in assurance of forty millions of dollars of additional revenue, shall be called up in the Senate. Free entry for foreign sugar, the application of a bounty to stimulate the home-production of sugar over a large area of our country, and the output of our twenty-two hundred products from furrow to factory, all under reciprocal treaties, will best befriend all our industries, that of sugar included. To "reform the currency," in fine, we have only to reform our wasteful methods in respect of revenue and industrial incomes.

A. K. Miller.

III.

After the experience of the last four months, the business interests of the country demand that a recurrence of such financial insanity and business congestion as we have recently passed

through should be made impossible. The politicians, who have for the last thirty-five years been at the bottom of all our misery financially, should be warned off by the business interests of the country and made to understand that the time has arrived when party interests must be relegated to the rear and reform be brought about of so drastic a character as to bring federal finance into line with the most approved principles of currency circulation.

If Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce could bring such pressure upon Congress as would lead to the appointment of a commission to report upon the defects of our own system, and point out the advantages of other systems—those, for instance, of France and Scotland—there might be prepared early in the session of the new Congress a bill which would commend itself to every patriotic citizen who has the love of his country at heart.

I take it the objects of such legislation, when obtainable, would be to first prove that "the piebald currency" of the United States government is entirely unconstitutional, and we should return as rapidly as possible to the fundamental principles upon which the fathers of the country established our rights.

The constitution partly defines the duties of the federal government, to be: "to coin money; regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin." Further on it defines what States *cannot* do, namely: "coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

The makers of those sections had a lively knowledge of the "continentals" unredeemed to the extent of $200,000,000.

Hence silver was degraded, its functions usurped by fiat paper, and currency troubles began in 1862 with the issue of greenbacks and their use as legal tender, which were intensified later by national bank notes, Bland certificates, and Sherman notes.

How shall these be eliminated from the circulation without a contraction of the currency, and our own available silver made to do its legitimate duty, as it does in France, namely, answer all purposes for till-money, pocket-money of the people, and the domestic exchange of the country, gold being used only for the foreign exchanges? I would suggest that the first thing neces-

sary would be to require the commercial men of the country and our bankers to agree upon a report which when embodied in legislative enactment would drive out of circulation $346,000,000 of greenbacks; $336,000,000 of Bland certificates; $160,000,000 of Sherman notes; and some $225,000,000 of National Bank notes, turning into circulation $600,000,000 of silver and $120,000,000 of so-called gold reserve now lying in the United States Treasury and its branches performing no good service.

Thus the banking business of the country would be left to those to whom it legitimately belongs—the people themselves—and the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury would be confined to the collection of revenue and its disbursement according to law. Legislation would also be required to cover a scheme looking to the federation of the 14,000 banks in the country, after the example of the Bank of France, by which the bulk of their cash capital might be concentrated in the vaults of a central bank of issue and re-discount, and its branches, for reserve, against which should be issued legitimate bank paper, in denominations of not less than ten dollars. The working of such a bank, guarded by Federal officials, has been ably set forth in detail by the editor of our *Bankers' Magazine*. The action of such a plan would be of so automatic a character that the bank note would be always based upon gold and silver coin and live assets.

The successful operation of such a method is not a thing of speculation in New York, for in the panic of 1893 the bankers of that city had recourse to the same principle, when they, in return for deposits of gilt-edged securities to the New York Clearing House, issued what are known as Clearing House certificates. Within the last few months the banks of New Orleans were reported to have prepared a scheme for the issuance of Clearing House certificates based upon this same proposition. If this was found practicable in New York and effected the salvation of the credit of that city at the time, why should it not be made available for the entire country? It would furnish a legitimate bank note, exchangeable at par in every State, guaranteed by coin deposits of the bank issuing the note, and it would open a way by which silver could be utilized to the same extent in the United States as it is in France, say, twenty dollars per capita.

We sent to the Brussels Monetary Conference representatives

who were permitted to air the many silver fads which lately culminated in a free silver plank, and wrecked a great national party. M. Tirard, one of the French representatives, replied to these and other so-called bimetallists by tersely telling them that when they returned home they should have their peoples use silver to the extent of five dollars per capita, which would solve the monetary problem and raise silver to par.

Think of the effect of such a reform of our present financial disabilities. With a population of seventy-five millions using twenty dollars per capita, forcing into circulation $1,500,000,000 of silver, the effect would be such an appreciation in the price of that metal as would bring it shortly to par, for it would take probably ten years to mine and mint our demand.

The gold reserve of the country would be limited to the settlement of foreign accounts, and all the weight of credit which now lies upon gold only would be distributed over $1,500,000,000 of of silver and $1,000,000,000 of legitimate bank notes.

The coin capital of the country would be at once trebled by the issuance of bank paper based on gold, silver, and gilt-edged securities, leaving a safe reserve in the Central Bank and its branches of thirty-three and one-third per cent. gold coin.

I have been amused greatly at the way in which Eastern people talk of "solid" money, considering how little they make use of it, preferring, apparently, fiat paper.

A neighbor of mine tells me of a Californian not very long ago entering a shoe-store in New York and purchasing a pair of slippers. The price was seventy-five cents. He handed the clerk a twenty-dollar gold piece, and noticed the typewriter, the accountant, the salesman, and the "boss" with their heads together. After consultation the clerk approached the Western man, handed him the twenty-dollar gold piece, and took back the slippers! They were positively afraid to give the change, fearing that the coin was "bogus."

The same thing happened six months ago in a hat store in Philadelphia, where one of my neighbors tendered a twenty-dollar gold piece in payment of a two-and-a-half-dollar hat. The clerk returned from the cashier's desk and said that "they did not have the change until the proprietor returned from his lunch."

In November last, the writer was a delegate from the Chamber of Commerce of this city to a convention of Ship Owners and

the National Grange, at Worcester, Mass. My hotel bill was sixteen dollars ; I laid on the counter a twenty-dollar gold piece, which the clerk first tried with his teeth, then rang on a glass-plate, and said : " You are from California, sir, are you not ? " To which I replied in the affirmative.

" This is gold ? "

" Certainly," I said.

By this time there had gathered around me not less than half a dozen men, who, by their looks of interest, had never before, apparently, seen a twenty-dollar gold piece. The change handed to me was soiled, dirty paper, instead of clean, white silver.

In conclusion, I cannot do better than quote Chief Justice Field's dissent—may that seer live to see this abominable legal-tender heresy struck from the statute books :

" In the case of Augustus D. Juillard, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas S. Greenman : Supreme Court of the United States, March 3, 1884 :

" From the decision of the court I see only evil likely to follow. There have been times within the memory of all of us when the legal-tender notes of the United States were not exchangeable for more than one-half of their nominal value. The possibility of such depreciation will always attend paper money. This inborn infirmity no mere legislation can cure. If Congress has the power to make notes a legal-tender and to pass as money or its equivalent, why should not a sufficient amount be issued to pay the bonds of the United States as they mature ? Why pay interest on the millions of dollars of bonds now due when Congress can, in one day, make the money to pay the principal ? And why should there be any restraint upon unlimited appropriations by the government for all imaginary schemes of public improvement if the printing press can furnish the money that is needed for them ? "

HUGH CRAIG.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE REPEOPLING OF IRELAND.

WHILE the familiar struggle of the Irish against the English continues to be in evidence wherever there are Irishmen, things have arrived at the pathetic stage in Ireland. To the stranger entering Dublin or Belfast it looks as if the island that had given letters to England had been repeopled by Britons. In every business thoroughfare the names that meet the eye are suggestive of England, Scotland, and Wales. The admixture of French, German, Italian, and Spanish names, so common in England, is reproduced apparently in the same proportions.

When one takes up the leading daily newspapers enough is found to corroborate the opinion that the repeopling is an accomplished fact. In a recent issue of a Dublin journal, *The Irish Times*, there appeared in the advertisements 325 names—English, Welsh, Scotch, French, German, Italian, and Spanish—to 55 Irish names.

The owner of the leading Irish newspaper was born in Scotland, Sir John Arnott, Baronet, and the name of the founder, Knox, is associated with a stirring period of Scottish religious history in the sixteenth century.

In the leading directory of Ireland—Thom's—there is found an abundance of material in favor of the same line of thought. The lists of landowners, magistrates, Protestant clergymen, and veterinary surgeons make poor account of distinctively Irish names. In the manufacturing districts of the country the paucity of Irish names is remarkable. From one end of the island to the other the great industries, with few exceptions, are operated by men whose names are not Irish.

The sprinkling of Irish names is large in the medical list. When the pages devoted to the Roman Catholic Church are examined the Celt comes into greater prominence. Most of the bishops have Celtic names. In the ranks of the clergy the Macs and the O's are numerous, but there are many names that would not be out of place in the English Church directory, *e. g.*, Curoe, Knaresboro, Warren, Watterson, Rogers, Pye, Hanna, Russell, Lee, Dawson, Barton, Hope, Everard, Wheeler, Harold, Wyer, Hayden, Grey, Gray, Jones.

English is the language of the country. It is taught in the public schools, and, with rare exceptions, exclusively spoken in the homes. Very few of the Roman Catholic clergymen in English-speaking Ireland are capable of preaching in the mother tongue, and even if they were, fewer still would be able to understand them. Within fifty years a great change has taken place in regard to the Irish language. Protestants and Catholics formerly knew something of it. At the popular watering places along the southwest coast, the children prattled in Irish and Irish was the language

of the army of donkey-boys and bathing-box women. Now the donkeys are cudgeled by boys who use the English language and the younger bathing-box women are recognized for natives by the sweetness and softness of the "brogue."

In some of the remoter rural districts of Connaught, Munster, and Ulster, Irish is still spoken, but in the commercial and manufacturing centres it is virtually a dead language.

The leverage won by the late C. S. Parnell induced the English government (Conservative) to build some light railways through the Irish-speaking counties and these will prove potent Anglicizing agencies. An effort is made through a central society in Dublin to promote a love for the old tongue, but the results thus far do not indicate much of a success. The Christian Brothers, a worthy body of Roman Catholic educators, have taken the matter in hand also. Irish manuscripts of priceless value are safeguarded by Trinity College and the Royal Irish Academy at Dublin. Outside the narrow circle of the antiquary they do not excite much interest. The descendants of men who were established in Ireland at the point of the sword find no attraction in documents that relate to a period of the country's history when it it had no connection with England. It matters little to them that a greater number and variety of antique golden articles of remote age have been found in Ireland than in any other part of Northern Europe, or that the majority of the gold antiquities, illustrative of British history, now preserved in the British Museum, are Irish.

Many schemes have been favored by the British government for the repeopling of Ireland. Colonies composed of German and French Protestants received special inducements, and the doors were thrown wide open to the English, Scotch, and Welsh farmers to settle upon the richest valley lands. It is due to this policy that the most fertile and prosperous parts of Ireland are occupied exclusively by English-speaking people.

After emigration became general the natives poured out in a continual stream to the United States, Canada, Australia, and to England, Scotland, and Wales. For a century Ireland has been growing in attraction as a field for settlement by natives of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain. In the midst of the outcry against English injustice new blood has been flowing into the country from many lands. This tide has been most remarkable during the two famine periods since 1841. According to the census of that year there were in Ireland 23,861 persons who had been born elsewhere. Of this number 14,684 were natives of England and Wales, 5,848 of Scotland, and 3,329 foreigners of different nationalities.

The census of 1891 shows an increase of nearly 47,000 in the total number of persons born out of Ireland. The number of natives of England and Wales had increased to nearly 50,000, of Scotland to over 6,000, and of foreigners of different nationalities to nearly 15,000. In sifting the information from the census one finds that Dublin county and city received nearly 6,000 more than Antrim of the settlers from England and Wales, 688 more from Scotland, and 1,339 more foreigners. Judging from the reputation of Belfast, this will be a surprise to those who have been accustomed to think that the northern capital contains the only loadstone in Ireland. The County of Cork followed closely on Dublin, and the County of Kildare closely on Cork. All three have drawn a larger number of new settlers than Antrim. The shares of the rest of the counties were very much alike. Fifty thousand of an increase in the "outlander" population would mean almost nothing in the

United States, but in the little bit of territory which includes the English-speaking portion of Ireland it meant a great deal. The Jewish population has largely increased also. This must be regarded as a sign of prosperity, for as a rule Jews of mercurial temperament don't change from one country to another for climatic reasons.

The English-speaking people of Ireland, friendly to England, have scored heavily on the side of intelligence. They are Irish by reason of birth, as the descendants of the English in the United States are Americans. From them have come some of the most eminent poets, essayists, historians, novelists, orators, lawyers, astronomers, explorers, preachers, soldiers, and sailors that the world has ever known.

Among poets, essayists, historians, and novelists, Swift, Goldsmith, Sterne, Burke, Moore, Berkeley, Lecky, Bryce, Charlotte Bronte, Maria Edgeworth: among dramatists, Sheridan, Knowles, Boucicault: among musical composers, Balfe, Wallace: among men of science, Thomson (Lord Kelvin), Tyndall: among astronomers, Lord Rosse, Sir Robert Ball: among Arctic explorers, Maclure, McClintock: among lawyers, Whiteside, Fitzgerald, Cairns, Russell: among soldiers, the Duke of Wellington, conqueror of Napoleon; Viscount Beresford, Lord Gough, Lord Wolseley, Lord Roberts.

In the long roll of diplomats the most distinguished for a century have been men of Irish birth and British lineage, including the Marquis of Dufferin.

At this moment the Inspector-General of the Navy, the ablest generals in the service of England—Lord Roberts, Lord Wolseley, Commander-in-Chief of the Army—and Lord Russell of Killowen, Lord Chief Justice of England, are Anglo-Irish.

An interesting fact in connection with the recent "Irish Race Convention" at Dublin was that among the delegates there were 151 who could not be identified with Ireland by reason of their names.

Moses Cornwall, Irish born, representing a section of his countrymen resident in South Africa, was a prominent figure. Without an explanation no one would have thought of him as Irish, no more than they would of identifying with the Green Isle Delegates Buist, Silk, Dobie, Ruane, Bulhert, Rockett, Bonfield, Engledow, Marel, Millard, Charrelton, Verling, Beechinore, Torish, Lundon, Nanetti, Callachor, and Capstick.

One of the mistakes made by Irishmen who are in the fight against England is in supposing that the drain on the Celtic population would be stopped if legislative independence were granted.

With a greater number of Celtic Irishmen out of Ireland than in Ireland, the tendency must ever be to draw the flower of each generation to other lands. It would be a heart-breaking termination of the struggle of the agitators if the Home Rule flag should float at last over a thoroughly Anglicized Ireland.

GEORGE HENRY BASSETT.

WOMEN AS CENTENARIANS.

WHAT will surprise most of those who investigate the subject of long life for the first time is the statement that women exceed men to such a great extent. A group of people cited by one of the most careful and least credulous of the numerous English authors of works on the subject, shows that out of 66 persons who were a hundred years old and upwards, there

were 43 women to 23 men. A census of centenarians taken in France in 1895 gives 213 persons of 100 years and over, of whom 147 were women and 66 men. The oldest was a woman who had just died at 150 in a village of the department of Haute Garonne. Nearly all of the centenarians belonged to the lowest ranks of life. In London, the census of 1891 shows 21 centenarians, 5 men to 16 women. Our census of 1890 gives 3,981 persons of 100 years of age, or over, of whom 1,398 were men and 2,583 women. Of course the disproportion is not always so great as this, but it seems to be a well-established fact that woman has the preference in the race for longevity. Though more boys are born in all countries than girls it is more difficult to rear them. In the diseases of infancy and early life females appear to have an inherent vitality and the number of deaths of boys is greater, even then, than the mortality among girl children. Weaker sex, as the men are fond of characterizing them, they excel us in enduring qualities and what is commonly spoken of as "toughness." Some physicians think that the greater mortality among boys may be owing to the larger size of their heads, and the more prolonged pressure undergone during birth. There is said to be also less wear and tear of the smaller machinery of the frame with women than there is with men. From this some might expect that small people of both sexes would succeed in living longer than large ones. But this does not seem to be the case. It is noted as a rather curious fact, which is shown by official reports, that the rate of the pulse and of respiration is quicker also in the weaker sex.

Men and women are bound to die some time. That is conceded; but if one finds this world pleasant by reason of living a life of temperance in food as well as drink, the blood is preserved in good condition and the body lasts longer. Blood vessels are apt to take the lead in the slow inevitable failure as the years pass, induced by the morbid condition of the blood bringing on loss of, or lowered, vitality with sure predisposition to various forms of disease. With almost everything in their favor the rich seem to stand at the same disadvantage in regard to longevity as they do, according to the gospel, in their efforts to enter the kingdom of heaven. Nearly all the centenarians were poor, and if they did not have as good a time in this world they stayed longer in it. Modern physicians appear to think that science, or the skill of their profession, has had a decided tendency to prolong life. Not that they have exactly succeeded in proving this claim, but as they are much given to blowing their own trumpets and beating their big drums on the strength of it, we may for the present admit it. Dentists say that the reason people's teeth do not last so long as other parts of the body is that modern skill has extended life so much longer than it was ever intended to last that the teeth cannot keep up with the demands made upon them. In other words, man, in the natural state, does not live so long as civilized man.

Again, to return to our centenarians of the female sex. It is said that the very nature of their occupations protects them by keeping them so much in the house, where they are shielded from adverse influences of atmospheric changes, accidental causes of death—to which so many men are subject—and the perils of certain manly pursuits and pleasures. Soldiers, sailors, miners, engineers, and persons engaged in similar occupations are all men. But then, do not all reports of the habits of centenarians and the tables of statistics prove that out-of-door exercise is one of the best means of preserving health. Statistical tables may sometimes prove too much. However, there is no record of any modern woman living to such extreme age as "Old

Parr"—153 years. Though the number of women who live to a century or a little more is undoubtedly greater than that of men, yet the men in the few cases have gone to a higher figure. And so we shall have to leave the question. There are more women that live long, but they cannot go to the highest points.

Pressure on the stomach and liver is not the only evil of the corset system, for the lungs and heart have to suffer also. Careful measurements made of Indian girls, who had lived a life of nature, prove that they breathe not from the upper part of the lungs almost entirely, as modern young women do, but just like young men and boys. The bodies of these young women were born just like those of the Indian girls, but the lacing and compressing waist system began at so early an age that the utmost effort of nature to start the girl of civilized life on a parity with the girl of nature has been carefully defeated. In a state of nature a woman has a child and is out, sometimes the same day, or at any rate the next one, just as if she had had a slight cold. Motherhood is painless. The civilized girl is prostrated for weeks. If she is not often a physical wreck for life, she is an exception. And then come the soured temper, bad digestion, fretfulness, and generally miserable domestic life which make the weary husband wish that he had never, never thought of marriage. When it becomes the Paris fashion to have waists like the Venus of Milo, then our girls will wear them—not before. Writers on the subject and talkers also may just as well save time and let the poor things torture themselves in their own way. Better study longevity, gentlemen, and not waste time by letting your thoughts run on waists.

As to the question of marriage, the Registrar-General for Scotland published some tables of statistics in 1867 to prove that married men live longer than the unmarried. Scientific critics in England and other countries, however, have questioned the accuracy of these tables, not holding that they were deliberately and of intention false, but that the experiment was not conducted on fair or just principles. These contestants may have been bachelors of centenarian proclivities, and having a reputation to sustain, they would naturally examine a married man's tables with close and scrutinizing suspicion. For, say the opponents of this theory, if a man lives longer by reason of marrying one wife, could not he then double his age or his chances of longevity by marrying two? Perhaps wives are to be taken, however, like those of Henry VIII. of England, only one at a time, though he had six and then did not live to be a centenarian. The easons given by old people for their long length of years are often seemingly absurd. *The Scientific American* of December 16, 1893, had an account of Miss Eliza Work, of Henrietta, N. Y., who was within six weeks of being 100 years old. "The reason I have lived so long is that I have never drunk tea nor coffee, and, above all, *never got married*, and I have always been hearty and healthy, too." At the age of 91 she travelled alone to her native place in Vermont. She has always been a hard worker, never had occasion to use glasses, and her teeth are of original growth. Her brother lived, she stated, to be 101, and she thought he would have lived much longer if he had never married. He drank tea and coffee, too. People who drink such things, Miss Work thought, and then aggravate the case by getting married, ought not to expect to live long. And yet Miss Work, being herself a centenarian, knows, perhaps, almost as much about the case as physicians.

WILLIAM KINNEAR.

OBSTACLES TO BUSINESS METHODS IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

GENERALLY speaking, we have bad city government in America, and we agree that business methods should prevail in its administration. The question then arises, what obstacles stand in the way of applying business methods to our municipal affairs. Briefly stated, the answer is: 1. American commercialism; 2. The spirit of partisanhip; 3. The misplacement of emphasis since the outbreak of the Civil War; 4. An erroneous political perspective; 5. Executive legislation; 6. Want of local autonomy.

I. Under the head of commercialism, a number of influences of various kinds have to be considered.

1. Commercialism, or undue absorption in private business or an undue desire to accumulate wealth, has been the distinguishing characteristic of the average American during the present century, and especially since the Civil War. It is the one feature more frequently referred to and more generally commented upon by foreign observers than any other. It is no doubt true that the rapid development of our country and its unparalleled growth in wealth and numbers have absorbed the energies of our people; and now that we have passed the stage of expansion, and entered another, which should be one of cultivation, we seem unable to leave off the habit formed largely under the spur of necessity, and which was undoubtedly essential to recovery from the evil effects of internal dissension.

Commercialism has led to the absorption of the best business talent in every community in private business affairs, mainly because the legitimate rewards are larger, and because there is a permanency of tenure not to be found in public affairs.

The returns in mercantile, manufacturing, and professional pursuits have been much larger than the honest returns to those holding equally responsible official positions in our cities. I admit there is a certain honor attached to public office; and that there should be a certain amount of self-sacrifice for the public welfare; but we may not always be able to afford such honors or make such sacrifices. So long as the returns from the same amount of application in public business are so disproportionate to those received from private business, we shall find the latter absorbing the best administrative and executive talent to the manifest detriment of the former.

Then, again, a young man starting out in private business knows that, with diligent attention to details and close application, he will be enabled to improve his position and his emoluments. The results of his efforts will be in a direct ratio to the energy expended. Let the same young man enter the public service and his tenure of office will not depend on capacity or application; but, in nine cases out of ten, upon his usefulness to a political leader or organization. When this ends, his tenure ends. He can retain his place only by subserviency—a course that must always prove distasteful to the conscientious young man. Is it any wonder, therefore, that private affairs irresistibly attract young men? Is it any wonder that we find the public service in many cities filled with men who cannot make a livelihood elsewhere, and who resort to public patronage when all other resources fail? Commercialism robs the public services of its best men and leaves it almost bare; a wrong political system steps in and deprives what little there is left of its value.

2. Commercialism leads not only to the absorption of business talent in private affairs, but also to the diversion of the constructive talents of the

community into the same channels. There is no denying the great constructive abilities of the Anglo-Saxon. In former times they were utilized in building up the state and nation and perfecting great governmental schemes; but of late years there has been little if any progress along governmental lines at all in keeping with the immense strides we have taken along commercial and manufacturing lines. The creation of great factories and great trusts and business concerns; the inventiveness displayed in mechanical and electrical trades seem to have exhausted the constructive genius of the country. Here the question of returns comes in again. The same amount of skill and ability displayed in public affairs will not bring a tithe of the return that an equal amount exerted in private business would. I am not now taking into consideration anything but legitimate returns, for the dishonest men can perhaps make more out of public office than in private business. I am considering only the honest rewards to be had in both services. As a result of this tendency, we have the rather curious condition of great advance in business, an advance that has placed us at the head of the commercial world; while in municipal methods we are a generation or so behind in our development.

3. Another result of commercialism is seen in the indifference of the average voter, who is generally so wrapped up in his business that he forgets to discharge his duties as a citizen. He reasons that the amount of time he would devote to political affairs if expended in private business will yield a return very much larger than the increased tax he will be subjected to by permitting incompetent men to run the city. In other words, he will pay higher taxes rather than devote good and valuable time to public business. It may be said in passing, however, that if every citizen would give but five hours a year to the consideration of public business; very great changes in present methods could be inaugurated. This would allow two hours (a generous allowance) for attendance on two primary and two general elections, and three hours for general conference, consideration, and attendance on one or two meetings.

4. Inasmuch as most if not all of our state and national taxation has been indirect, insignificant as compared with European taxes, due to the fact that we have no immense armies or navies or expensive royal families to support, voters have not as yet felt the full effect of high municipal taxation and extravagant and inefficient local government. The fact is that, after all that can be said against bad city government, the cost of maintaining it (at least from the financial view point) is comparatively small and bears but indirectly upon the average citizen. The business man is accustomed to sacrifice a small benefit in one direction to earn a larger one in another; and he carries this principle into his consideration of public affairs. He will agree that we have bad government and should have better; but he sacrifices the benefit that would accrue to him in this direction to gain a larger one in his private affairs.

5. The spirit of commercialism has also had another effect, of a somewhat different character, however, from those mentioned. Many who devote their brains and energies to the consummation of great undertakings have found that it is good business to conciliate and control the governing powers. Constantly seeking franchises and privileges, they have realized that a better bargain can be made when all the parties to it are of one opinion and on one side. Their policy has therefore been to make the interest of the granting powers identical with their own by taking them "in on the ground

floor," or by paying them outright for favorable votes and influence. This has been very much more profitable than paying to the city the true value of such privileges and franchises.

II. Next to commercialism, the greatest obstacle is partisanship, or the prostitution of public office and public measures to party success. A party, as a means to an end, is all right and proper, but as an end in itself it is all wrong; and yet in the United States we have made party and party success the end to be attained. To accomplish this we have utilized the offices. They have served, not to promote the comfort, happiness, and well-being of the people primarily, but to pay off party debts and to strengthen the party's working force.

III. During the Civil War, and for many years after, the rallying cry in our politics was "Measures, not men!" a cry still heard and still effective. So grave were the issues before the public during and immediately after the war, that they fell in with the idea that measures were everything, and men of but subordinate importance. Always a mistaken and unwise policy, it is still more so now, when the issues are mainly business ones.

The conditions of American political life we have been discussing apply with considerable if not equal force to State and national, as well as to municipal, politics. Those which we shall refer to hereafter apply only to municipal affairs.

IV. For sundry reasons which need not be referred to in the present connection the American people have formed an erroneous conception of the importance and extent of municipal government. They have come to regard it as of subordinate importance and have awarded first place in their interest and attention to national and State issues. As a general rule, we find more space accorded to news concerning the latter than the former in the newspaper; and the average reader turns first to State and national news, leaving to the last, and more frequently entirely overlooking, the doings of municipal officers and bodies. The same tendency is to be seen in the interest manifested in elections. At the quadrennial presidential elections the greatest excitement prevails; the issues are widely and earnestly discussed and the merits of candidates canvassed. The vote polled is larger than at other elections and many vote only at such elections. Gubernatorial campaigns arouse but little less interest and bring out but a slightly smaller vote. When we come to municipal elections, however, the vote falls off to a marked degree, and apathy prevails, unless some issue accidentally introduced creates a temporary interest; or the election can be construed to have an important bearing on national or State elections.

V. Most if not all of our American cities fail to endow their executive officers with sufficient power to secure a well-rounded, continuous business-like conduct of municipal affairs. They permit the local legislatures to interfere to too great an extent in the conduct of purely executive business, with the result of preventing the officers in charge carrying out any plan involving careful preparation and slow execution.

VI. Want of local autonomy is simply the operation on a large scale of the obstacle just mentioned. Not only have we erred in our general plan of municipal government by modelling it to too great an extent on our federal government, with elaborate checks and balances, a bicameral system, and so on, but also in permitting our State legislature to have too much to say as to municipal affairs.

CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF.

INDEX

TO THE

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD VOLUME

OF THE

North American Review.

ABBOTT, FRANCES M. The Pay of College Women, 337.
ADAMS, J. C. Reform of the Currency, 743.
ALEXANDER, JOSEPH P. The Truth About the Opium War, 381.
ALLEN, GRANT. Novels Without a Purpose, 223.
America, An Industrial Opportunity for, 316.
America's Duty to Americans in Turkey, 276.
American Bicycles in England, 688.
American Diplomats in Europe, 125.
American Industry Languishes, Why, 488.
An Electric Farm, 509.
Anglo-Saxon Criminal Jurisprudence, Roman and, 75, 333.
Anglo-Saxon Race, The Future of the, 129.
Animal as a Machine, The, 607.
An Industrial Opportunity for America, 316.
Are the Farmers Populists? 266.
Aridity, A Problem of, 711.
Art, Purpose in, 504.
Asiatic Labor, The Plain Truth About, 620.

Ballot, Why Women Should Have the, 91.
Bank Depositors, Protection of, 564
BARRETT, JOHN. The Plain Truth About Asiatic Labor, 620.
BASSETT, G. H. The Repeopling of Ireland, 753.
BENHAM, GEORGE A. The Supreme Court, 505.
BESANT, SIR WALTER. The Future of the Anglo-Saxon Race, 129.
Best Currency, The, 416.
Bicycles, American, in England, 688.
Bimetallism, Natural, 219.
BLAIKIE, W. G. Woman's Battle in Great Britain, 282.
BLAND, RICHARD P. The Duty of the Hour, 368.
BLIND, KARL. Russia After the Coronation, 17.
BOTTOME, MARGARET. Petticoat Government, 101.
British Honduras, From a Silver to a Gold Standard in, 257.
British Press, The Power of the, 168.
BRYAN, WILLIAM JENNINGS. Has the Election Settled the Money Question? 708.
Buildings, High, 580.
Campaign Issues and Prospects of the, 175.
Canadian Elections and Their Result, The, 156.
Can the Criminal Be Reclaimed? 207
CARNEGIE, ANDREW, The Ship of State Adrift—II., 496.
Centenarians, Women as, 755.
CHANDLER, W. E. Issues and Prospects of the Campaign, 175.
CHATFIELD-TAYLOR, H. C. American Diplomats in Europe, 125.
Church Property, Taxation of, 254, 633.
City Noises, The Plague of, 296.
CLARK, F. E. Some International Delusions, 28.
CLARK WALTER. If Silver Wins—Inevitable Constitutional Changes, 462.
CLARKE, R. F. Neo-Malthusianism, 345.
Coinage, A Common, for all Nations, 47.
College in American Life, Influence of the, 517.
College Women, The Pay of, 337.
Colonies, Penal—Agricultural and Industrial, 676.
Coming Struggle on the Nile, The, 326.
Common Coinage for all Nations, A, 47.
Competition, Railway, The Necessity of Limiting, 121.
Constitutional Changes, Inevitable, 462.
Contentiousness of Modern Novel Writers, 395.
CRAIG, HUGH. Reform of the Currency, 748.
Criminal, Can the, Be Reclaimed, 207.
Criminal Jurisprudence, Roman and Anglo-Saxon, 75, 333.
Cuba, What Shall be Done About, 731.
Curfew for City Children, 725.
Currency, The Best, 416.
Currency, Reform of the, 743.

Declaration of Independence in the Light of Modern Criticism, The, 1.
Defence of Our Electoral System, A, 637.
Delusions, Some International, 28.
DILKE, SIR CHARLES W. Election Trials in Great Britain, 573.
Diplomats, American, in Europe, 125.
DOANE, W. C. Some Later Aspects of Woman Suffrage, 537.
Duty of the Hour, The, 362.
Duty of the Republican Administration, The, 696.

ECKELS, JAMES H. Protection of Bank Depositors, 564; The Duty of the Republican Administration, 696.
Educational Uses of Hypnotism, 448.
Education in England, Prospects of, 427.
Effect of Republican Victory, The, 513.
Election Trials in Great Britain, 573.

Elections, The Canadian, and Their Result, 156.
Electoral System, a Defence of Our, 637.
Electoral System, Our, 402.
Electric Farm, An, 509.
Engineer in Naval Warfare, The, 641.
English Epitaphs, 595.
EVANS, R. D. The Engineer in Naval Warfare, 654.
EWING, NEAL. A Defence of Our Electoral System, 637.
Experience, The Safe Pathway of, 385.
Farm, An Electric, 509.
Farmer, What the Country is Doing for the, 527.
Farmers, Are the, Populists? 266.
FELSENTHAL, E. I. Roman and Anglo-Saxon Criminal Jurisprudence, 383.
France's Task in Madagascar, 479.
From a Silver to a Gold Standard in British Honduras, 257.
Future of the Anglo-Saxon Race, The, 129.

GIBBON, JOHN. Why Women Should Have the Ballot, 91.
GIBBONS, CARDINAL. The Teacher's Duty to the Pupil, 56.
GIRDNER, J. H. The Plague of City Noises, 296.
Gold Standard, From a Silver to a, in British Honduras, 257.
GORST, The Right Hon. Sir JOHN E. Prospects of Education in England, 427.
Government by Party, 587.
Great Britain, Election Trials in, 573.
Great Britain, Woman's Battle in, 282.
GRIFFITHS, ARTHUR. Penal Colonies—Agricultural and Industrial, 676.

HALL, PRESCOTT F. Italian Immigration, 252.
HAMLIN, CYRUS. America's Duty to Americans in Turkey, 276.
HARGER, C. M. A Problem of Aridity, 711.
HARRISON, MRS. BURTON. A Newport Symposium, 236.
HARWOOD, W. S. What the Country is Doing for the Farmer, 527.
Has the Election Settled the Money Question? 703.
HAZELTINE, M. W. What Shall be Done About Cuba? 731.
HERBERT, HILARY A. Why American Industry Languishes, 488.
High Buildings, 580.
HIMMELWRIGHT, A. L. A. High Buildings, 580.
Hindrance to our Foreign Trade, A, 438.
How to Prolong Life, 249.
Hypnotism, Educational Uses of, 448.

Immigration, Italian, 252.
Independence, The Declaration of, in the Light Modern Criticism, 1.
Inevitable Constitutional Changes, 462.
Influence of the College in American Life, 517.
Ireland, The Repeopling of, 753.
Is Japanese Competition a Myth? 144.
Issues and Prospects of the Campaign, 175.
Italian Immigration, 252.

Japanese Competition, 144.
JERNIGAN, THOMAS R. A Hindrance to Our Foreign Trade, 438.
JULIAN, G. W. Some Ante-Bellum Politics, 195.

Jurisprudence, Criminal, Roman and Anglo-Saxon, 75, 383.
Justification of Martial Law, The, 549.

KINNEAR, WILLIAM. How to Prolong Life, 249; Women as Centenarians, 755.
Labor, Sound Money the Safeguard of, 98.
Late Session of Parliament, The, 304.
LATHROP, GEORGE PARSONS. Stage Scenery and the Vitascope, 377.
LEPPER, GEORGE H. Natural Bimetalism, 219.
LIEBER, G. NORMAN. The Justification of Martial Law, 549.
Life, How to Prolong, 249.
Lincoln, Some Memories of, 667.
LUCY, H. W. The Power of the British Press, 168.

Machine, The Animal as a, 607.
Madagascar, France's Task in, 479.
MAHAN, A. T. The Engineer in Naval Warfare, 648.
MAHANY, R. B. Sound Money the Safeguard of Labor, 98.
Martial Law, The Justification of, 549.
MASON, R. OSGOOD. Educational Uses of Hypnotism, 448.
MCCARTHY, JUSTIN. The Late Session of Parliament, 304.
MCCRACKAN, W. B. A President of No Importance, 118.
MERRILL, S. M. Our Electoral System, 402.
MILLER, A. K. Reform of the Currency, 745.
MILLER, WARNER. The Duty of the Hour, 362.
MOLONEY, SIR ALFRED. From a Silver to a Gold Standard in British Honduras, 257.
Money Question, Has the Election Settled the? 703
MONROE, HARRIET, Purpose in Art, 504.
MOSBY SPEED, The Taxation of Church Property, 254.

Natural Bimetallism, 219.
Necessity of Limiting Railway Competition, The, 121.
Neo-Malthusianism, 345.
NEWCOMB, H. T. The Necessity of Limiting Railway Competition, 121.
Newport Symposium, A, 236.
Nile, Coming Struggle on the, 326.
Novels Without a Purpose, 223.
Novel Writers, Contentiousness of Modern, 395.

Obstacles to Business Methods in Public Affairs, 758.
Opium War, The Truth About the, 381.
O'RELL, MAX. Petticoat Government 101.
OSWALD, F. L. Storm Tracks, 115.
Our Electoral System, A Defence of, 637.
Our Electoral System, 402.
Our Foreign Trade, A Hindrance to, 438.
Our Neglected Shipping, 470.
Our Trade with South America, 716.

PARKER, GEORGE F., American Bicycle in England, 688.
Parliament, The Late Session of, 304.
Party, Government by, 587.
Pay of College Women, The, 337.
Penal Colonies—Agricultural and Industrial, 676.

PETERS, MADISON C. Taxation of Church Property, 638.
Petticoat Government, 101.
Plague of City Noises, The, 296.
Plain Truth About Asiatic Labor, The, 620.
PLATT, T. C. The Effect of Republican Victory, 513.
Politics, Some Ante-Bellum, 195.
PORTER, R. P. Is Japanese Competition a Myth? 144.
Power of the British Press, The, 168.
President of No Importance, A, 118.
Privacy, The Right of, 64.
Prospects of Education in England, 427.
Protection of Bank Depositors, 564.
Public Affairs, Obstacles to Business Methods in, 758.
Pupil, The Teacher's Duty to the, 56.
Purpose in Art, 504.
Purpose, Novels Without a, 223.

QUINCY, JOSIAH. Issues and Prospects of the Campaign, 182.

REED, T. B. The Safe Pathway of Experience, 385.
Reform of the Currency, 743.
Relation of Spain to Her Government, The, 634.
Repeopling of Ireland, 753.
Republic, The Stepchild of the, 37.
Republican Administration, The Duty of the, 696.
Republican Victory, The Effect of, 513.
REPPLIER, Agnes. Contentiousness of Modern Novel Writers, 395.
Right of Privacy, The, 64.
ROBINSON, LOUIS. Wild Traits in Tame Animals—VI., 164.
Roman and Anglo-Saxon Criminal Jurisprudence, 75, 383.
ROMERO, M. Criminal Jurisprudence, Roman and Anglo-Saxon, 75, 383.
RUSSELL, J. W. The Canadian Elections and their Result, 156.
Russia After the Coronation, 17.

Safe Pathway of Experience, The, 385.
SEARCH, THEO. C. Our Trade with South America, 716.
Ship of State Adrift, The—II., 496.
Shipping, Our Neglected, 470.
Shrinkage of Wages, The, 456.
Silver, from a, to a Gold Standard in British Honduras, 257.
SMITH, ALEX. R. Our Neglected Shipping, 470.
SMYTHE, W. E. The Stepchild of the Republic, 37.
Some Ante-Bellum Politics, 195.
Some International Delusions, 28.
Some Later Aspects of Woman Suffrage, 537.
Some Memories of Lincoln, 667.
Sound Money the Safeguard of Labor, 98.
South America, Our Trade with, 716.
SOWERS, E. An Industrial Opportunity for America, 316.
Spain, The Relation of, to Her Government, 634.
SPEED, JOHN GILMER. The Right of Privacy, 64.
SPOFFORD, HARRIET PRESCOTT. Petticoat Government, 101.
Stage Scenery and the Vitascope, 377.
STAHL, JOHN M. Are the Farmers Populists? 266.
State, The Ship of, Adrift II., 496.
STAUNTON, S. A. The Engineer in Naval Warfare, 660.
Stepchild of the Republic, The, 37.
STONE, C. W. A Common Coinage for all Nations, 47.
Storm Tracks, 115.
Supreme Court, The, 505.
Symposium, A Newport, 236.

Tame Animals, Wild Traits in, VI., 164.
Taxation of Church Property, 254, 633.
TAYLOR, FREDERICK. France's Task in Madagascar, 479.
TAYLOR, I. A. English Epitaphs, 595.
Teacher's Duty to the Pupil, The, 56.
THURSTON, R. H. The Animal as a Machine, 607.
THWING, CHARLES F. Influence of the College in American Life, 517.
TOURGEE, ALBION W. The Best Currency, 416.
TOWNSEND, Mrs. JOHN D. Curfew for City Children, 725.
Trade with South America, Our, 716.
Trade, A Hindrance to Our Foreign, 438.
Truth About the Opium War, The, 381.
Turkey, America's Duty to Americans in, 276.
TYLER, MOSES COIT. The Declaration of Independence in the Light of Modern Criticism, 1.

Vitascope, Stage Scenery and the, 377.

Wages, The Shrinkage of, 456.
WALKER, JOHN G. The Engineer in Naval Warfare, 641.
WALSH, GEORGE E. An Electric Farm, 509.
Warfare, Naval, The Engineer in, 641.
WARING, GEORGE E., Jr. Government by Party, 587.
What the Country is Doing for the Farmer, 527.
What Shall be Done About Cuba? 731.
WHITE, ARTHUR SILVA. The Coming Struggle on the Nile, 326.
Why American Industry Languishes, 488.
Why Women Should Have the Ballot, 91.
Wild Traits in Tame Animals—VI., 164.
WILLIAMS, H. S. Can the Criminal Be Reclaimed? 207.
WILLIAMS, L. The Relation of Spain to Her Government, 634.
WILSON, JAMES F. Some Memories of Lincoln, 667.
WINDMULLER, LOUIS. If Silver Wins: The Shrinkage of Wages, 456.
Woman Suffrage, Some Later Aspects of, 537.
Woman's Battle in Great Britain, 282.
Women as Centenarians, 755.
WOODRUFF, C. R. Obstacles to Business Methods in Public Affairs, 758.